

OCT 19 1956

Bulletin

Vol. XXXV, No. 902

October 8, 1956

OPENING OF DISCUSSIONS ON STATUTE OF INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Welcoming Address by Lewis L. Strauss 535

Statement by James J. Wadsworth 537

INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING IN THE BUSINESS WORLD • *Remarks by President Eisenhower* .

551

TRANSCRIPT OF SECRETARY DULLES' NEWS CONFERENCE OF SEPTEMBER 26

543

INSCRIPTION OF SUEZ ITEMS ON SECURITY COUNCIL AGENDA • *Statement by Ambassador Henry*

Cabot Lodge, Jr 560

For index see inside back cover

OFFICIAL
WEEKLY RECORD
UNITED STATES
FOREIGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XXXV, No. 902 • PUBLICATION 6400

October 8, 1956

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1955).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Opening of Discussions on Statute of International Atomic Energy Agency

WELCOMING ADDRESS BY LEWIS L. STRAUSS CHAIRMAN, U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION¹

It is my privilege and great honor, on behalf of my fellow countrymen, to welcome you to the United States for the historic deliberations which you are about to undertake. I bring you warmest greetings from President Eisenhower and his sincere good wishes for the success of this conference.

The fervent prayers of all mankind attend your labors here. Peoples of many lands look hopefully to you, not alone to spread the bounties of the beneficent atom that their lives may become healthier and more abundant but that in so doing you will also provide the foundations upon which a durable structure of peaceful understanding will eventually be erected.

This is the largest conference of nations to be held since the end of the Great War, indeed perhaps the largest in the entire history of international collaboration. Thus, your voice can be the voice of humanity itself, the conscience of the world of men.

Since the end of the last war, the nations of the earth have been caught in the endless spiral of an atomic arms race. As recently as 3 years ago, there appeared to be no formula, and no hope, for averting mutual disaster. Indeed, 3 years ago a convocation for a purpose such as that which has brought you together today would have been unthinkable.

In the midst of the thick darkness of those days a lamp was kindled. Its light first shone forth in this very hall. Some of you perhaps were so fortunate as to be here on that late December

afternoon in 1953. Standing at this very lectern before the representatives of your governments, standing in effect in the presence of all humanity, President Eisenhower pronounced the words which broke the evil spell that war had cast upon the world.

They will be long remembered, and it is fitting to recall those sentences today.

He said:

It is not enough to take this weapon out of the hands of the soldiers. It must be put into the hands of those who will know how to strip its military casing and adapt it to the arts of peace.

The United States knows that if the fearful trend of atomic military buildup can be reversed, this greatest of destructive forces can be developed into a great boon, for the benefit of all mankind.

And he went on to say this:

The United States knows that peaceful power from atomic energy is no dream of the future. That capability, already proved, is here—now—today. Who can doubt, if the entire body of the world's scientists and engineers had adequate amounts of fissionable material with which to test and develop their ideas, that this capability would rapidly be transformed into universal, efficient, and economic usage.

He then outlined his plan for the international agency, including the pooling of fissionable materials for peaceful uses and the establishment of safeguards against any use of those materials for other than peaceful purposes. He said:

... the United States pledges before you—and therefore before the world—its determination to help solve the fearful atomic dilemma—to devote its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life.

When he reached the conclusion of his message, an ovation swept through the great assemblage.

¹Made at the opening of the Conference on the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency at U.N. Headquarters on Sept. 20 (U.S. delegation press release).

It evidenced the profound effect which his pronouncement had made upon his listeners. I shared with many of you the drama of that moment and sensed, in what will always remain as one of the most moving experiences of my life, the electric response which began in this room and echoed around the world, lifting the hopes and stirring the imaginations of men everywhere.

No longer could it be said that man's genius in pushing back the frontiers of the physical universe had outstripped his moral inspiration to control his discoveries.

What the President proposed was motivated solely by desire to find a way out of the atomic dilemma which had fastened itself upon the world and thereby to lift the darkest cloud overhanging humanity. His proposal was a product of bold vision, yet it had the great virtue of simplicity. It was above all else an easily workable plan, practicable yet uninvolved.

In the months following President Eisenhower's proposal, discussions were undertaken among those nations having either developed resources of nuclear raw materials or advanced atomic energy programs, and on December 4, 1954, the General Assembly of the United Nations by unanimous vote endorsed the proposal to create an International Atomic Energy Agency.

In late February of this year, representatives of 12 nations met in Washington. After 4 months of earnest, cooperative labor, they produced the draft statute which will be before you.²

This statute, or charter, is not a panacea for all the ills of the world. It will not within any precisely measured time turn all deserts into green pastures. It will not relieve man of the necessity to labor for his daily bread. It will not usher in the millennium.

Functions of Agency

However, the creation of the International Atomic Energy Agency under the conditions envisaged by the draft statute *will* do these things:

It will accelerate the application of the peaceful uses of atomic energy everywhere, reaching the uttermost parts of the earth.

It will divert important amounts of fissionable material from atomic bomb arsenals to uses of benefit to mankind, and those amounts will steadily

grow with the maintenance of peace. More tons of these materials will be devoted to welfare, fewer tons to weapons.

It will stimulate the discovery of new fundamental data on which all progress depends.

It will provide an opportunity for nations which have little or no atomic capability at present to acquire atomic facilities best suited to their needs either individually or in combination with their neighbors.

It will increase man's knowledge of his own body and that of the plants and animals that nourish him, and of the pests which threaten him, to the end that the art of healing will be advanced and new ways found to increase the food supply of the world. Man's span of useful life thereby should be prolonged.

It will be the means by which nations may obtain electrical energy to lighten their burdens and increase their productivity. It will thus contribute to higher standards of living in the world.

It will encourage young and imaginative minds in many countries to seek careers in the new disciplines of nuclear science and engineering to the end that they may improve the economy and health of their homelands.

And, of course, most important of all, the successful operation of the agency will contribute mightily to focus world attention and understanding on the gifts which atomic energy can make toward enriching human life and thus dispel some of today's doubts and fears.

The cooperation which is foreseen under the provisions of the draft statute will be international. This is proper, for the atom itself is international. It has no politics, follows no party line, and recognizes no geographical frontiers or allegiances. The language it speaks is universal.

The little group that witnessed the first controlled chain reaction in Chicago in December 1942 included men native to many lands. Their leader was the great Enrico Fermi, by birth a son of Italy. Among his colleagues were scientists from Canada, Hungary, and Germany. And contributing to that moment of triumph were the genius and the accumulated discoveries of other men and women from other lands. Such names as Einstein, Hahn, Strassman, and Meitner of Germany, Bohr of Denmark, Rutherford and Chadwick of England, the Curies of Poland and France, Mendeleev of Russia, and Raman of India, to name only a few of an illustrious galaxy.

² For text, see BULLETIN of May 21, 1956, p. 852.

Pooling Atomic Knowledge

Knowledge of the atom cannot be claimed as a monopoly of a few large countries. This fact was dramatically highlighted at the great Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Geneva in August of last year, when the scientists and engineers of 73 nations met in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual purpose and exchanged information on the peaceful development of the atom. I am happy to have been concerned with the inception of that fruitful and memorable gathering.

This process of pooling knowledge of the atom has continued in the year that has passed since the conference. Scientific delegations have been exchanging visits and ideas, motivated only by the spirit of human progress. A scientific committee has been established under the aegis of the United Nations to study the effects of radiation. Nuclear science symposiums have been held in a number of countries, and a large and important sharing of the results of current research has resulted from smaller international conferences, such as those dealing with high-energy physics held earlier this year.

In the spirit of these events, it is our hope that while in the United States you will find it possible to visit our national laboratory at Brookhaven, which is not far from this city, and—if your time permits, and I hope it will—journey to Shippingport, Pennsylvania, to see our first full-size atomic power plant exclusively for commercial power production, which we began just 2 years ago this month and which is nearing completion there.

Through all of these activities, the United States has contributed in keeping with our confidence in the eventual success of this conference. The steadily expanding extent of our cooperation with other nations in atomic energy matters, including agreements which we have negotiated with 39 nations, is an earnest of that fact. We believe that our technology and atomic materials should benefit other peoples as well as our own. We also believe that necessary safeguards to health and peace must accompany the development of the atom.

You will recall that President Eisenhower in his address of December 8, 1953, spoke of allocations of fissionable material to the agency, by ourselves and by others, "to the extent permitted by elementary prudence."

Last February 22, the President gave concrete form and vitality to the determination of the United States to aid other countries when he announced that the Atomic Energy Commission would make 20,000 kilograms of uranium 235 available for distribution to other nations for peaceful uses.³ This was an amount exactly equal to the uranium 235 made available for such uses in the United States. The President, in announcing the allocation, emphasized that the United States welcomes the progress toward the international agency and will cooperate with it wholeheartedly when it is established.

The faces of millions of people of every race and faith are turned toward this place today. Their hopes, indeed their prayers, that success shall here reward your efforts will surely overcome any barriers and resolve any differences that may yet block attainment of the great goal which is within your grasp.

STATEMENT BY JAMES J. WADSWORTH⁴

We now approach the last steps in the creation of the International Atomic Energy Agency which President Eisenhower proposed in this hall on December 8, 1953. If our work prospers as I hope and believe it will, this great conference of 81 nations will not rise until it has adopted a statute of the agency in its final text. Thereby we shall have taken a decisive step in translating into fact the vision which has inspired us all, the vision of world atomic cooperation and peace.

Many nations in the past 3 years have shared in this creative effort—nations from every quarter of the globe. In scope and in constructive spirit, the records of diplomacy in the past decade scarcely reveal its equal. It may be in order to take a brief glance over the road we have traveled.

In proposing that this agency be created, the President of the United States had in mind two major purposes, both aimed at strengthening world peace. The first was to channel nuclear materials from national stores into a new international agency and thereby begin, in his words, "to di-

³ *Ibid.*, Mar. 19, 1956, p. 469.

⁴ Made before the conference on Sept. 24 (U.S. delegation press release). Ambassador Wadsworth is U.S. Representative to the conference and chairman of the U.S. delegation.

minish the potential destructive power of the world's atomic stockpiles." The second purpose was to devise methods whereby fissionable material would be allocated to serve only the peaceful pursuits of mankind.

The United States has ever kept these twin objectives in view. We have been aware from the beginning that neither aim could be achieved by one nation, or even by a small group of nations, and that we were embarked upon a truly international enterprise. For that reason, throughout these proceedings we have frequently turned to the United Nations. For the same reason our negotiations themselves have proceeded in ever-widening circles. The main steps in those negotiations are worth reviewing.

Main Steps in Negotiations

First, an eight-nation group worked early in 1954 to prepare a first draft of a statute for the proposed agency.

Second, the subject was thoroughly debated at the Ninth General Assembly in 1954.

Third, on August 22, 1955, the draft statute as it then stood⁵ was circulated to get the views of all members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies—a total at that time of 84 states.

Fourth, the subject was again debated at the Tenth General Assembly in 1955, and a resolution endorsing the efforts of the negotiating group was unanimously adopted.⁶

Fifth, the working group, now expanded to 12 nations by the inclusion of Brazil, Czechoslovakia, India, and the Soviet Union, met in Washington starting last February 27. For almost 2 months this group, encouraged and guided by a resolution of the United Nations General Assembly, worked to revise the draft statute. In doing so, it considered, and often adopted, ideas and suggestions not only of the four new members of the drafting group but of other nations the world over from whom comments had been received.

Sixth, the resulting draft, unanimously approved on April 18 by the 12-nation working group, now lies before this conference for final action.

⁵ For text, see BULLETIN of Oct. 24, 1955, p. 666.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Nov. 14, 1955, p. 801.

Mr. President [João Carlos Muniz], you who served so ably as the distinguished leader of the Brazilian delegation at that working group meeting in Washington will agree, I am sure, that it was an impressive success. We found that the differences of view were often great. But even greater was the will to bridge those differences. All the delegations, without exception, showed patience and persistence equal to the task. As a result, the draft statute before us today was adopted unanimously. This unanimity, in a world plagued by many deep political differences, augurs well for this meeting. Though some reservations have been entered on specific points, we are encouraged by the fact that, in comparison with the differences which our joint efforts have met and overcome, the questions still to be resolved do not loom too large.

Mr. President, the United States was one of those which joined in the unanimous approval of the draft statute without reservation. There are parts of the statute which we might wish were different. In fact, I am sure that none of the sponsors regards the statute as perfect from its own particular point of view. I am equally sure that all of the sponsors believe, as we do, that the draft statute lays the foundation for an agency that will work and work well, one to which we can all give wholehearted cooperation. The United States is prepared to support this statute. We have no present intention of proposing any amendments other than one, which we plan to sponsor with others, which would clarify the functions of the preparatory commission provided for in annex I.

At the same time, the United States comes to this conference prepared to give respectful consideration to any amendments submitted. We shall support those which we believe would improve the statute and enhance its acceptability. Mr. President, we shall oppose those which, in our view, would not do this—especially those which might make full cooperation of any specific group of states difficult or impossible.

I submit that this is a sensible approach. The draft statute reflects to a great degree a balance of views of a large number of states. Any proposed change should therefore be carefully scrutinized in order to insure not only that it is in fact a change for the better but also that it does not

endanger the balance of views thus far achieved.

Mr. President, this is not the time for me to draw a picture of the material blessings which may come to the human race through the full harnessing of the atom for peace. The marvelous potential of atomic technology is known to the world. The agency will greatly advance the peaceful atomic revolution. It will multiply manifold the energy at the service of man, stimulate economic development, and promote the interchange of scientific knowledge. The draft statute before us, in our view, would permit the agency to realize these high aims and would justify generous support by the United States.

Problem of Safeguards

In addition to the requirement that the statute empower the agency to promote peaceful uses of atomic energy, it is indispensable that there be real assurance that the agency's activities will not further the use of atomic energy for military purposes and will not jeopardize health or safety. Atomic energy, as we all know, is uniquely dangerous as well as uniquely promising. The fuel for a reactor can be made into the explosive of a bomb; the radiation which cures can also kill.

The United States has given much thought to the problem of safety and security with all that it implies. This problem has also been of great concern to other states. We recall that the Soviet Union initially took the view that to encourage peaceful development of atomic energy throughout the world would increase world insecurity by increasing the supply of materials from which nuclear weapons could be made. We are very glad that the United States and the U.S.S.R. both agree that the right solution to the problem is to apply adequate safeguards and not to curtail peaceful development.

The provisions in the statute on safeguards are designed to permit peaceful development of atomic energy without jeopardy to world safety and security. I would like first, Mr. President, to refer to article II, which sets forth the agency's basic objectives. It reads as follows:

The Agency shall seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to the peace, health, and prosperity of the world. It shall ensure, so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose.

To accomplish the latter objective, article XII

prescribes certain definite safeguards. The application of these safeguards would be a common effort with international participation. The statute would also permit the agency to apply its safeguards to bilateral or multilateral arrangements otherwise not subject to its supervision or control, if the parties to such arrangements so request. The United States hopes that parties to bilateral arrangements throughout the world will avail themselves of this provision, thus contributing toward the eventual establishment of a uniform system of safeguards of universal application. If this is done, Mr. President, the United States can look forward to making the agency the cornerstone of its international activities in the field of atomic energy for peace.

In supporting these safeguards, we are quite aware that their aim is somewhat limited—even if all "outside" bilateral and multilateral arrangements were ultimately to come under agency safeguards. We well understand that much of the military danger of the atom lies beyond their reach—indeed beyond the reach of the agency itself. We know there is nothing in the draft statute to prevent states from building nuclear weapons with their own resources. We also know that the draft statute in no way limits the ability of states which today produce nuclear weapons to continue producing them. But the fact that the agency will not be able to solve the whole immense world problem of nuclear weapons control does not exempt us from the duty to do all we can to provide full safeguards for the agency's own sphere of operation.

Let me recall to my fellow delegates that the President of the United States has recently made a proposal that future production of fissionable materials should no longer be used to increase the stockpiles of explosive weapons. "My ultimate hope," he said, "is that all production of fissionable materials anywhere in the world will be devoted exclusively to peaceful purposes."⁷ Acceptance of this United States proposal would mean the application of safeguards to the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and other states capable of making atomic weapons. These safeguards would certainly have to be more complete and more pervasive than those applied to recipient states under this statute.

We shall continue to strive for agreement which will translate President Eisenhower's proposal

⁷ *Ibid.*, Mar. 26, 1956, p. 515.

into reality. Meanwhile what we do to safeguard operations in the new agency is a significant step toward the goal. By its own safeguards the agency can increase mutual confidence and provide technical and political experience helping us toward our still more ambitious goal—a world where the atom is devoted exclusively to the arts of peace.

Mr. President, I have gone into some detail in this matter of safeguards in order to emphasize what the International Atomic Energy Agency can do, and indeed must do, to curb the destructive misuse of atomic energy. Its still more basic purpose is the positive and creative development of the atomic era for human prosperity and welfare. Let us be under no illusions: there is much to be done, much to be learned before the atom can be widely and economically used for power. It is the duty of the agency to hasten the doing and to hasten the learning.

Work of Preparatory Commission

At the conclusion of this conference, the preparatory commission for which the statute provides should meet as soon as possible to begin the tasks required to bring the agency into being. One of the first questions which the preparatory commission will consider will be the location of the agency's headquarters. In this connection, the United States was one of the first to express its support for Vienna, a great center of civilization which we think would be an ideal site.

The general conference of the agency should be convened as soon as enough ratifications have been received to make this step worth while. In the meantime, we would urge that the preparatory commission draw up, for discussion and approval by the first general conference and board of governors of the agency, a realistic, responsible, practical program of operation.

In this way we should, within a year from now, see the International Atomic Energy Agency a going concern, actually at work making its vital contribution toward a peaceful and a stable world.

Mr. President, the statute we are considering here exists only because of the dogged determination of every one of the 12 nations which took part in writing it. These countries, with all their strong and differing views, were united in one thing—the will to agree.

We have already seen the fulfillment of a fer-

vent wish voiced by President Eisenhower—the wish that this proposal might, in his words, “open up a new channel for peaceful discussion.” That channel is open today. For my part, Mr. President, I believe that it will stay open because I am confident that every delegation present here has the same faith and the same determination to succeed that has made it possible to bring this draft before you.

Last year's conference on atomic energy in Geneva created a new atmosphere for scientific and technical interchange, an atmosphere of openness and mutuality where before there had been secrecy and insularity. One great challenge of our conference—and indeed it is one of the great challenges of our time—is whether we can bring about the same kind of change in the international *political* atmosphere, whether we can devise institutions that will permit man's most impressive scientific achievement to be put to work for his well-being.

Tomorrow's world will largely depend upon what is done with atomic energy. What is done with atomic energy will largely depend on the outcome of this conference. Let us hope—and pray—that a few weeks from today we shall be able to say to our fellow men: “We have done something here that makes it more likely that we and our children will live out our lives in peace”; that, in the words of the United Nations Charter, we have done something “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.”

U.S., U.K., Canada To Interchange Atomic Energy Patent Rights

On September 24 the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State (press release 503) announced that the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada have entered into an agreement interchanging rights in inventions and discoveries in the atomic-energy field on which patents were held or applied for by one government in one or more of the other countries as of November 15, 1955.

The purpose of the tripartite agreement is to allow use of the inventions in each country by government and industry without interference of the other governments. This is done by a “cross assignment” of rights, under which each government assigns to the others the rights, title, and

interests owned by it in the other countries. Each assigning government retains a nonexclusive, irrevocable, paid-up license on each invention for its own purposes and for purposes of mutual defense.

The exchange gives full rights to each government in its own country and permits it to grant licenses to industry in accordance with national policy. It will permit the U.S. Government, with respect to the inventions acquired from the Canadian and United Kingdom Governments, to grant royalty-free licenses to American industry. The exchange also will permit the Canadian and United Kingdom Governments to follow their own domestic policies relating to patents.

A nondiscrimination clause in the agreement binds each government to grant licenses to nationals of the other governments on the same terms accorded its own nationals.

The agreement is expected to be of particular benefit to the growing private atomic-energy industries in each of the signatory countries by eliminating questions of patent infringement. Firms engaging in home manufacture will need licenses only from their own governments, and, in view of the agreement's antidiscrimination provision, firms of one country engaging in business in one or both of the other countries cannot be discriminated against by the governments of the other countries.

All inventions and discoveries which are the subject of government-owned patents or patent applications as of November 15, 1955, are affected. These are of two classes:

1. Inventions known as CPC (Combined Policy Committee) inventions, which arose from wartime collaboration among the three governments. In these cases, the inventors assigned their rights to the governments employing them and the patent rights obtained or applied for were held in trust pending settlement of the interests of the three governments.

2. Inventions and discoveries which, though within the cooperative arrangement, were developed independently and are owned by one government.

The cutoff date of November 15, 1955, was selected as a matter of convenience. The intent of the agreement is that the interchange of rights shall cover the period during which atomic-energy operations were largely a government monopoly in

each of the three countries. The agreement does not commit the governments for the future, nor does it affect inventions made as a result of the agreements for cooperation in atomic energy entered into by the United States with the United Kingdom and Canada on June 15, 1955.¹

CPC inventions total about 50, and patent applications have been filed on many of them in all three countries. The number of patents or patent applications relating to work carried on independently of the wartime cooperative arrangement amounts to several hundred. Many of the applications are still classified, and this has limited the number of patents issued so far.

Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America, the Government of Canada, and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland as to Disposition of Rights in Atomic Energy Inventions

The Government of the United States of America, the Government of Canada, and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

Recognizing that the rights, title and interests in certain inventions and discoveries (known as Combined Policy Committee inventions) resulting from wartime cooperation of the Governments of the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom are held in a fiduciary capacity at present; and

Believing (1) that it is desirable at this time to make the final disposition of the rights, title and interests in those inventions and discoveries, and (2) that mutual benefit will result from the interchange of rights, title and interests in existing inventions and discoveries in the field of and related to atomic energy which are the subject of patents or patent applications by one Government in the country of one or both of the other Governments;

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The term "Government" or "Governments" in this Agreement shall be deemed to include:

1. In the case of the United States, the United States Atomic Energy Commission;

2. In the case of the United Kingdom, the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority;

3. In the case of Canada, the Atomic Energy Control Board, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited, National Research Council, and the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys.

ARTICLE II

It is desirable to make final and ultimate disposition of the rights, title and interests in the Combined Policy Committee inventions, thereby terminating the fiduciary

¹ BULLETIN of July 11, 1955, p. 59.

provision heretofore applying. To that end, the Government or Governments employing the inventor or inventors shall own the entire rights, title and interests in any such Combined Policy Committee invention which is the subject of a patent or patent application in one or more of the three countries.

ARTICLE III

In addition, it is desirable and to the mutual benefit to exchange certain rights, title and interests in all inventions or discoveries in the field of atomic energy which are the subject of patents or patent applications by one Government in the country or countries of either one or both of the other two Governments as of November 15, 1955.

ARTICLE IV

With respect to any invention or discovery within the scope of Articles II and III, each Government, within the limits of its ownership as of November 15, 1955:

1. Shall transfer and assign to the other Government or Governments such rights, title and interests as the assigning and transferring Government may own in the other's country, subject to the retention by the assigning and transferring Government of a non-exclusive, irrevocable, paid-up license to make, use and have made or used such invention or discovery by or for the assigning and transferring Government or for purposes of mutual defense.

2. Shall accord the right to a non-exclusive, irrevocable, paid-up license to the other Governments to make, use, and have made or used such invention or discovery by or for such other Government or Governments or for purposes of mutual defense in all countries.

3. Shall not discriminate against nationals of the other Government or Governments in the grant of licenses in any patents or patent applications owned by each Government or in which each Government acquires ownership or rights under this Agreement, but shall accord licenses to nationals of the other Government or Governments on the same or as favorable terms as it accords licenses to its own nationals (including its Government owned or controlled corporations when such corporations practice the invention or discovery in the performance of services for a party other than the licensing Government).

4. Shall waive any and all claims against the other Government or Governments for compensation, royalty or award as respects any invention or discovery within the scope of Articles II and III, and release the other

Government or Governments with respect to any claim on any such invention or discovery.

ARTICLE V

This Agreement shall come into force on the date of signature.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Agreement.

DONE at Washington this twenty-fourth day of September 1956, in three original texts.

FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

C. BURKE ELBRICK
LEWIS L. STRAUSS

FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA:

A. D. P. HEENEY

FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND:

ROGER MAKINS

Icelandic Foreign Minister Invited to Washington

Press release 513 dated September 29

In response to a suggestion made by Icelandic Foreign Minister Emil Jonsson, he has been invited to come to Washington to exchange views with U.S. authorities concerning the defense installations in Iceland. Mr. Jonsson is expected to arrive in Washington September 30.

Letters of Credence

Uruguay

The newly appointed Ambassador of Uruguay, Julio A. Lacarte Muro, presented his credentials to President Eisenhower on September 28. For the text of the Ambassador's remarks and the text of the President's reply, see Department of State press release 511.

Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference

Press release 508 dated September 26

Secretary Dulles: I have a short statement to read, copies of which will be available, I hope, before you leave.¹

U.S. Objective in Suez Situation

The purpose of the United States in relation to the Suez situation is precisely that which is set forth in the first article of the charter of the United Nations, namely, to seek a settlement "by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law." Now this is not easy to do quickly. There is not acceptance by all as to what is "just," nor as to the rights of the nations under international law. Therefore, a settlement in accordance with the provisions of the charter calls for patience and resourcefulness. We are confident that with these qualities there will be an agreed settlement.

Some may ask what are the inducements for the kind of settlement that we seek if force is not used. How can a nation be brought to accept a settlement which recognizes the rights of others? The answer is that no nation can live happily for long or live well without accepting the obligations of interdependence.

When a nation's conduct frightens others, there are inevitable consequences. For example, the tone of some of the official utterances of the Government and of the press in Egypt has been so intensively anti-Western that many foreigners are being frightened away and tourists are not coming to Egypt and thus Egypt loses foreign exchange needed to pay for the imports which the Egyptian people want. Some commercial activities in Egypt are drying up because they depend upon foreign markets and foreign sources of credit and these are not readily available to a nation which

rejects the implications of interdependence. Until recently important business and financial interests were thinking in terms of enlarging and deepening the Suez waterway with consequent benefit to Egypt. Now their thoughts are of big tankers and additional pipelines which will make it possible for nations to be less dependent upon the Suez Canal.

It is understandable that a country which until lately has been under foreign rule should be highly sensitive on matters of sovereignty. We must, in this respect, be tolerant. But we need not feel frustrated, because if we are patient, yet persistent and resourceful, there is a good chance that Egypt will come freely to recognize the importance of working with, and not working against, the many important countries which use the canal and which want good relations with Egypt.

We believe that the proceedings which are to begin this afternoon in the United Nations Security Council will help to bring about the just solution called for by the first article of the charter.

Now if you have any questions.

Q. Mr. Secretary, will the United States back the British-French position in that U.N. debate, as we know it so far?

A. Well, I think in general that we will. There has not yet been any definitive formulation of precisely what relief the British and French will seek of the Security Council, so that I can only say we assume that it will follow the general lines of what was found at our first London conference to be a just and fair solution.² It will probably also follow the lines of the second conference as to what we think might be a provisional solution which might be adopted pending agreement on

¹The following seven paragraphs were also released separately as press release 507 dated September 26.

²For text of 18-nation proposals of Aug. 23, see BULLETIN of Sept. 3, 1956, p. 373.

a permanent solution.³ Within the context of those two conferences and their actions will probably be found, basically, the British and French position. On that assumption we would expect to be in accord with them.

Q. Are you going yourself to New York, sir?

A. I am not going today. I quite possibly will go when the matter comes up for substantive discussions, particularly if the other Foreign Ministers, or several of them, are present to present their case. I think it would be courteous for me to go there and hear their presentation and perhaps make a substantive presentation of my own in view of the active part I have taken in this matter so far. I wouldn't expect to be up there for a long period to follow the entire proceedings, which might be somewhat protracted.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you said at some point the users association, which will now shortly be formed, will present a ship or convoy to go with a pilot to the Egyptian Government at the mouth of the Suez Canal to determine whether the Egyptian Government will permit one of the association's pilots to operate in the canal.

A. Well, I think it is quite likely that that practical situation will be presented, although probably not in the immediate future, because it is going to take a little time to get the association organized and to make the arrangements to get pilots. But one of the things that we hope for is that, if the problem is presented in a practical way at the working-level basis, there may be at least a provisional result which will be temporarily acceptable to both sides and that would be a good way to present the issue.

Q. Now I would like to ask one followup question. At a previous press conference when this kind of situation was discussed the question of alternatives also came up.⁴ If the Egyptian Government should refuse this or other acceptable terms of transit, would you be prepared to take alternative measures such as sending ships around the continent of Africa?

A. We have no legal power to direct ships to particular voyages. But we assume, if they can-

³ For text of joint statement and declaration of Sept. 21, see *ibid.*, Oct. 1, 1956, p. 507.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Sept. 24, 1956, p. 476.

not get through the canal upon reasonable terms and in view of the decision of the United States, at least, as I put it, not to shoot its way through the canal, that they would in fact go around the Cape. That, in turn, would involve a diminution in the amount of cargo that could be carried. That would be particularly felt in terms of oil. It would involve some cutdown in the oil which is drawn from the countries of the Middle East and its replacement with oil presumably from this hemisphere. That might involve increased exports of United States oil, and under those circumstances the Export-Import Bank, as I indicated, would be ready to play its normal role in helping to finance those exports.

Q. Mr. Secretary, would the United States vote for the inscription of the Egyptian item in the Security Council?

A. I don't want to anticipate what our position will be on those matters which will be coming up in the next 2 or 3 hours in New York. I would rather wait, because we don't know precisely how those issues will be formulated. Ambassador Lodge will have the immediate responsibility, and I don't want to prejudice the situation by making comments which might not be applicable since we can't tell exactly what the procedure will be this afternoon.⁵

U.S.-Argentine Relations

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you discuss the scope of the role of Dr. Milton Eisenhower in United States diplomatic relations in Argentina?

A. Well, I suppose that you are referring to a piece which we both may have read in the paper this morning.

Q. Yes, sir.

A. I am quite willing to comment on that because it does relate to some factual matters relating to the conduct of United States foreign policy. I would say, first of all, that the relationship of Dr. Eisenhower to Latin America has been a highly constructive one. It has never involved any interference whatsoever with the normal functioning of the Department of State in relation to departmental matters and policy matters. He did, after his first trip, come back with certain recommendations with respect to increased

⁵ See p. 560.

trade, increased credit, increased investments, increased technical assistance, which were adopted and which have formed the basis of our foreign policy toward Latin America. In all those respects our relationship is at a new high.

Now as far as relates to the Perón government, I could just make these comments:

The first is that the Perón government came into power under our preceding administration. It went out of power under this administration.

The Perón government received loan agreements from our prior administration totaling upwards of \$100 million. It received no loan agreement from this administration, although we have extended credits now to the successor government.

Under our prior administration many of our newsgathering agencies were denied facilities in the Argentine. One of the first acts of this administration was to see that those facilities were restored.

Under our prior administration *La Prensa* had been seized and taken over by the Argentine Government. During this administration, through the action of the new Argentine Government, *La Prensa* has been restored and is functioning in freedom.

That is a record which, I think, ought to be known and of which this administration is proud.

Legal Rights of User Nations

Q. Mr. Secretary, in the prepared Suez statement you mentioned the fact there is a disagreement over the legal rights in this case. Is it the position of the United States that the legal right of user nations is to have a voice in the operation of the canal?

A. The users association is to help the ships, the vessels of countries who have rights under the 1888 treaty, to get the benefit of those rights on a *de facto* or practical basis. We are not, through that association, seeking primarily to raise a question of legal rights, however, but to see whether we can't get on to a practical operating basis with the Government of Egypt.

Q. I wasn't referring to the users association. I meant in the broad, legal context do you believe the user nations as a body or as individuals have a legal right to have a voice in the operation?

A. We believe that the treaty of 1888 internationalizes, you might say, the right of use of the

canal. It creates a sort of an easement across Egyptian territory, of which we believe the beneficiaries of the treaty as well as the parties to the treaty have the right to make use. And we believe they are also entitled to organize to exercise the right of use and, generally, their rights under the treaty.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in your statement you discussed the possibility of the construction of an alternative pipeline. There was mention today that the British and French today were considering pipelines by Israel or Turkey to bypass the Suez. Is the United States prepared to help in the financial cost of such construction?

A. Well, I haven't gone into that because I don't think there would be any occasion for the United States Government to help. I believe that the oil companies which are interested in assuring the steady and regular transit of oil have themselves the resources to do whatever they deem necessary in that respect; so the question of Government help has not come up so far as I am aware.

Q. Mr. Secretary, have we had any informal talks at the diplomatic or other level with the Soviet Union on the subject of the Suez, and, if not, do you think they might be useful or enlightening?

A. Well, of course, I had talks with Mr. Shepilov, the Soviet Foreign Minister, at the first conference of the 22 nations. We have had no talks since that time. It may be that, in view of the activities which will be going on now in New York at the Security Council and the fact that the Soviet Union is a member of the Security Council, there could be further informal discussions between any or all of the Security Council members. I don't exclude that as a possibility, but nothing has taken place of that sort since the first Suez conference in London. And nothing of a concrete nature is in contemplation.

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you define for us the position regarding tolls—both the present position and the prospects for the immediate future? I refer to the tolls paid for by United States ships and also for ships owned by the United States but under foreign registry.

A. It is planned, as I indicated in a letter^a which I left with the Foreign Minister of the United

^a *Ibid.*, Oct. 1, 1956, p. 507.

Kingdom in London just before I left last week, it is indicated that we will take steps to amend the present Treasury license so as to preclude any direct payments to Egypt and to permit such payments to Egypt only as they might occur through payments to the users association. Of course, you know the users association under its charter is authorized to make certain payments over to the Government of Egypt, because we do not expect Egypt to help maintain the canal entirely out of its own funds. And there could in that way be payments to Egypt through the users association, which would act, you might say, as an agent for the vessels. But outside of that, we would not expect that there would be any payments to Egypt by United States flag vessels. We do not have in mind extending that to vessels which are not of United States registry. That involves possible questions of conflict of laws, and, until we know more clearly what the views might be of the countries of registry, we do not expect, certainly initially, to impose a restriction upon those vessels. We would hope that they might find it desirable voluntarily to conform to the same practice as U.S. flag vessels. But the extension of our authority to vessels which are owned by corporations of other nations and incorporated under the laws of other nations and which fly under the flag of other nations is a step which we do not contemplate taking at the present time.

Q. Mr. Secretary, is there a legal power in the United States Government to direct shipowners to pay funds to the users association? My impression was that you could only prevent them being paid directly to Egypt if they were paid into blocked accounts in this country.

A. There is no authority to compel payments to any particular person. There is authority to prohibit payments to particular persons. Now, as I tried to explain, the action contemplated would be to prohibit direct payments to Egypt. We would not prohibit payments which might flow to Egypt through the users association if they chose to make payment in that way.

Q. That would be their choice?

A. That would be their choice. We can't compel them to pay the users association, but, if they pay neither Egypt nor the users association, their chance of getting through the canal becomes considerably less, so that we would assume as a prac-

tical matter they would, at least until they saw how it worked, pay into the users association.

Q. Mr. Secretary, Israeli sources say that some 70 tankers, among them Norwegian, Danish, and American, have been blacklisted over the last 2 years by the Egyptian Government in its blockade of Israel for attempting to haul food to Israel. In addition to that you will recall within the last several months, perhaps it's more than a year, an American ship was fired on by the Egyptians in the Gulf of Aqaba. Protests—diplomatic protests—have been made over these incidents to Cairo. But so far, unless I am misinformed, no other action has been taken and no results from Egypt. Against this background, is there any reason to believe that a ship brought by the users association to the canal under circumstances mentioned a minute ago, that anything would happen on our part, on the Western nations' part, if Egypt wouldn't let us through?

A. Well, I have said, when you talk about anything "happening" on our part, if by that you mean that we would try, as I put it, to shoot our way through, there is no reason to think that we would shoot our way through. I have excluded that, so far as that concerns any present United States policy. Now, I tried to point out in my opening statement that attitudes by any country which seem to be in defiance of the rights of others may, if that defiance is widespread, bring about repercussions which are undesirable, and undesired by the country which engages in that defiance. There are pressures which gradually grow up, not artificially stimulated but as quite natural and inevitable. I believe, if we are patient, resourceful, persistent, we can count on those pressures having some positive result. But I do not believe that the situation is such now as to call for any drastic action like going to war.

Q. Well, perhaps it would be helpful if you could clarify, sir, a point that you made the other day. I believe you said, in connection with the Suez, that, although pointing out that merchant ships usually are not armed, if a merchant ship was attacked in the canal, it would have the right to defend itself. Could you elaborate a little bit on that, as to what might ensue if something of that kind happened?

A. Well, I don't think it would be very useful to do that, because these ships that go through

the canal, these merchant ships and tankers, so far as I know, do not have any means to defend themselves; so it's a rather hypothetical question. I was asked, I think, what would happen if it was attacked. I said a vessel that is attacked has a right to try to defend itself. I doubt whether there is sufficient means to do that, to make it worth while to go any further than I did.

Route Around the Cape

Q. Can you clarify the going around the Cape, Mr. Secretary? If the canal remains open to the principal maritime powers, would we send our ships or expect our ships to go around the Cape if the users association were not able to get its ship through on its own terms, that is, on its own power?

A. Well, do you mean would we be the only country to send our ships around the Cape?

Q. If the canal remained open to the powers—that is, it wasn't closed to functioning normally—and the only ship that was turned back was a ship of the users association with its own pilot, would we expect it to go around the Cape? Would all members of the users association go around it?

A. Well, there is no obligation which results from joining the users association to act in unison, in respect to that matter, or to use the Cape. Each country decides for itself, or perhaps you can say each vessel decides for itself, what it will do. There are certain compulsions on tolls which apply to the United States registry vessels, or will apply after we have taken the action which I described, and there would be comparable compulsions which will be operated as regards the British and French ships and some of the others. But that results from the voluntary action of their governments, and nobody, by joining the users association, is obligated to take that action. Undoubtedly there will be some vessels which would try to use the Suez Canal under any circumstances. We can't prevent that. We cannot create, nor do we attempt to create, any universal boycott of the canal.

Q. But there would be an American boycott of the canal if the ships of the users association were turned back?

A. I didn't quite get the question.

Q. But there would be an American diversion of shipping if a ship of the users association were turned back?

A. Well, any ship that was diverted would automatically, I suppose, go around the Cape. But because one ship was diverted wouldn't necessarily mean that all would be diverted. Any ships that couldn't get through the canal would presumably go around the Cape.

Q. If Egypt closed the canal to shipping, I mean, it would be diverted. If Egypt closed the canal to a given ship, then it would go around the Cape?

A. That's right.

Q. Only under those circumstances?

A. Yes.

Q. In order to clarify this point, Mr. Secretary, for a moment, at least in my mind, would an association ship which goes to the mouth of the canal insist on using its own pilot even though an Egyptian pilot might be available to guide that ship through the canal?

A. No, I don't think so. I pointed out in a statement which I made in London—I think it was released to the press—it was in answer to a question put by the Japanese delegate, that the availability of association pilots was a convenience and not a matter of necessity. We have no power to compel American flag vessels to take any particular pilot or to refuse to take any particular pilot. That is a matter primarily for the master of the ship to decide for himself.

Q. Well, Mr. Secretary, just to go one step farther on that. If an American ship came up there, a member of the users association, with its own pilot, and asked permission to go through, and Egypt said very politely, "Well, you can go through if you use our pilot, but your pilot can't go through"—I think that's what Jack had in mind—then what would the action of that ship probably be?

A. It would be up to the master of that ship to decide what he wanted to do. If he wanted to take the Egyptian pilot, he is entitled to do so. We can't prohibit that. The issue is more likely to arise with reference to dues than it is with reference to the pilots, I think, because there the

master may be under a prohibition against paying directly to the Egyptian authorities.

Q. But isn't it a matter of fact, Mr. Secretary, that, since you are limiting this dues freeze or diversion only to United States flag ships, this does not greatly affect the ships owned by United States citizens or corporations since the bulk of those using the canal are under Panamanian or Liberian registry? So that, in effect, it probably would have little effect, and it would alter very little the amount of money now being paid by these companies and ships to the Egyptian Government?

A. That is a fact. But bear in mind that the amount of money which Egypt gets out of the Suez Canal is not a major factor in the Egyptian economy and the pressures which could be exerted by going around the canal would be relatively little. There will still be plenty of boats to go through the canal, because there are a lot of ships of some other registry. Ships will be transferred maybe to a registry which makes it easier for them to go through the canal, and there always will be as long as the canal is open—there will always be a certain amount of revenue to Egypt from that source. Perhaps it won't be quite as much, but, on the other hand, the burden on Egypt will not be quite as much either.

And I think we have to think a bit in terms of the fact that, if you try to hurt Egypt to the extent of a dollar at the cost to yourself of \$1,000 or \$10,000, that isn't a very profitable enterprise in the long run. It isn't as though this canal were vital to Egypt's economy. The amount of revenue that Egypt has derived from it has been somewhere between, I think, \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 in the past in terms of its share of the profits from the canal company, and the idea that any grave economic blow can be struck at Egypt through the nonuse of the canal is a quite false conception.

Now we do believe that there are certain rights involved which raise questions of principle. But the attitude we take is primarily in the exercise of our rights as a matter of principle, not because we believe that that is a profitable enterprise from the standpoint of ourselves or from the standpoint of striking any grave blow at Egypt.

The Implications of Interdependence

Q. Mr. Secretary, it was widely predicted that, if Egypt gets away with it, then the next step would be the nationalization of oil concessions

and then the Western bases in the Arab countries. Some Soviet diplomats in London were also quoted to that effect. Would you care to comment on such a possibility?

A. Well, I do not accept the possibility that Egypt, as you put it, is going to "get away with it." And the reasons why I don't accept that possibility are set out in my opening statement: that a nation which attempts to defy the reasonable rights of others, the reasonable requests of others, loses in an infinite number of unpredictable but certain ways. And the way in which Egypt will suffer the most is not, perhaps, through the diversion of a few ships from the canal, but it will be in these other ways. I think that Egypt will come to recognize that it is not good business to deny what I call the implications of interdependence. We live, all of us, in an interdependent world, and you cannot deny the principle of interdependence in one respect without suffering from that denial in a whole lot of other respects, and the consequences, in the long run, of persistence in this course to Egypt would be very bad. And I don't see any prospect of Egypt making a success out of the path it is now going. I believe that Egypt will lose in terms of its own economic development; it will lose in terms of the relationship which it has with other states, not excluding other Arab States. Therefore, I do not think that the course Egypt has embarked upon is a course which is going to lead to an Egyptian success. But the way to bring about a change, as I say, in my opinion, is not to go to war about it. This kind of Egyptian action is going irrevocably, inexorably to bring about certain consequences. Those are not consequences, I say, which are artificial, which are stimulated—these just are inevitable, and I think that that will gradually become apparent.

Q. Mr. Dulles, are you reconsidering any action on the Aswan Dam financing?

A. No, I am not.

Q. There have been some reports in the paper that you were.

A. Those reports are inaccurate. I explained at the time when we announced our decision about the Aswan Dam that the basic reason for not going ahead with it was because that Aswan Dam project, as then formulated, was a project of great magnitude, which required close cooperation of Egypt and foreign countries over a period of

around 15 years. I did not think it likely that that kind of an intimate, close relationship could be depended upon for that period of time. And those considerations and others mentioned at the time still prevail at the present time. In other words, the reasons why we didn't go ahead are just as valid today as they were before.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in connection with your previous answer—just previous to this one—if Egypt should persist in trying to get away with it, as it were, what other measures—economic, psychological, or otherwise—are we studying with an idea of applying them to increase the pressure?

A. We are not studying any methods with a view to applying them. We are not engaged in economic warfare against Egypt. But, as I point out, there are consequences, consequences which we couldn't obviate if we wished, the kind of consequences I talked about in my opening statement. Those are inexorable and are going to be there and constantly working. And it is those kinds of pressures, influences, which lead nations to accept the consequences of interdependence, because they gradually realize that an assertion of sovereignty to such an extreme that it frightens others destroys their credit and confidence in them. That, in the long run, is a policy which leads only to negative results, and I believe that gradual recognition of that fact will bring about a basis for a reasonable settlement here.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what view does the United States take of Israel participation in the Suez Canal Users Association?

A. Well, that matter has not come up. The provisional view which was taken at the second London conference was that the qualifications for membership would probably be similar to those which prevailed at the time of the first London conference, namely, 1,000,000 net tons or more of shipping through the canal during the prior calendar year, or a pattern of trade which showed approximately 50 percent or more dependence upon the canal. If those are adopted, as seemed to be forecast by the talks of the second London conference of the 18, then Israel would not be eligible to be a member.

On the other hand, you may recall that the proposal—that the statement that was issued about the users association did say that the facilities of the association would be made available to any vessels whether or not members. Because we be-

lieve that the principle of nondiscriminatory passage through the canal, in accordance with the 1888 treaty, is one we should recognize ourselves and that we should not try to set up an organization which obtained preferential rights for our members. So if any other vessel wants to get the facilities of the association, those facilities will be available to it.

Q. Mr. Secretary, then Israel, on the basis which you have just now discussed, would actually be deprived, as a consequence of the blockade that Egypt has practiced—Israel would have no way of having tons go through, because in the past 5 years, at least, no tonnage has been permitted to go through the canal and, consequently, this trade has had to be rerouted. Now in this sense wouldn't you say that Egypt would be in a sense again getting away with it as she has been with regard to Israel?

A. Well, as I pointed out, whether or not Israel is an actual member of the association is irrelevant from the standpoint of the facilities of the association being made available, let us say, to Israeli ships and to Israeli cargoes. They would have all the facilities of the association.

It is awfully hard to guess as to what the volume of Israeli trade would have been through the canal if it had been permitted, or what the number of vessels would have been, and so forth. So I doubt whether you could establish any criteria which would be based upon that kind of guessing, you might say. But I don't think that Israel is prejudiced by that result, because of the availability, as I say, of the facilities of the association to all ships.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there has been a new outbreak of border incidents between Jordan and Israel. Do you see in this new situation any danger of an adverse impact on the efforts to get a Suez Canal settlement?

A. Well, I deplore and regret the outbreak of additional border incidents. They seem to indicate the nonacceptance of the principles for which the Secretary-General of the United Nations strove when he undertook his recent mission to that part of the world. At the moment I do not see any likelihood of a direct relationship of nationalization to the Suez Canal situation. Conceivably, one might develop, but so far the two issues have been rather independent of each other.

Foreign Governments Invited To Send Election Observers to United States

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

Press release 512 dated September 28

In consonance with the program of increasing contacts between the people of the United States and the countries of Eastern Europe, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a policy which was announced June 29, 1956, by the President,¹ the Department of State has recently issued through its missions abroad an invitation to the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and Rumania to send representatives to the United States in October to view at first hand the free electoral processes in this country. As in previous election years, a number of representatives from other countries will arrive in October as guests of the U. S. Government.

The Department assumes that the invitation would be of special interest to government officials or to professors of government, political science, or law and has suggested that the representatives named be selected from these groups. It also assumes that, since such visits are understood to have a reciprocal basis, Americans would be invited to view elections in their countries on the next appropriate occasion.

TEXT OF INVITATION

In the interest of promoting mutual understanding, the United States Government invites the _____ Government to send two or three representatives to the United States for a fifteen-day period in order to familiarize themselves with the two-party electoral processes whereby the Chief Executive and Members of the Congress of the United States are chosen. It is assumed that this would be of special interest to certain government officials or to professors of government, political science or law and therefore suggests that the representatives named be selected from these groups. It is also suggested that a working knowledge of English would be most desirable to permit maximum advantage to be derived from the visit, although interpreters will be available as required. Travel to and from New York and expenses of the representatives while in the United States will be

arranged as well as an itinerary and program to permit the most advantageous observation of the two-party campaign. Representatives should plan to depart for the United States not later than October 22 and would finish their tour about November 7.

Since such visits are customarily understood to have a reciprocal basis, it is assumed that on the next appropriate occasion Americans would be invited to view elections in _____.

When the Foreign Office has responded to this invitation and nominated its representatives, the Embassy [Legation] will be glad to supply information and assistance regarding travel arrangements and visas.

Deputy Under Secretary Murphy To Visit Germany

Press release 506 dated September 25

The Department of State announced on September 25 that Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy will represent the U.S. Government at the laying of the cornerstone of the new Conference Hall (*Kongresshalle*) in Berlin on October 3.¹ Representative Kenneth Keating will also be present, as well as Mrs. Eleanor Lansing Dulles, Special Assistant to the Director of the Office of German Affairs.

The Conference Hall, dedicated to Benjamin Franklin, will be the U.S. participation in the International Building Exhibition in 1957. It is a unique structure, both because of its advanced design and because of the joint United States and German effort which has made it possible. It is now being built in the Tiergarten area near the sector border separating West Berlin from the Communist Sector. Its facilities will include various halls for assembly and discussion, including an auditorium for 1,200 persons.

During his visit to Berlin, Mr. Murphy, in addition to an address at the cornerstone-laying ceremonies of the Conference Hall, will address the Ernst Reuter Gesellschaft. This society honors the name of the late Mayor of West Berlin, who personified the courageous struggle of his fellow citizens against Communist pressure particularly during the Berlin blockade in 1948-49.

Mr. Murphy also will visit Bonn during his brief trip to Germany. In the course of his career in the Foreign Service Mr. Murphy has had close associations with Germany. He served at Munich in the 1920's and from 1948 to 1949 as political

¹ BULLETIN of July 9, 1956, p. 54.

¹ For background, see BULLETIN of Jan. 2, 1956, p. 15.

adviser to the United States High Commissioner at Frankfurt. He is also a former Acting Director of the Office of German and Austrian Affairs in the Department of State.

International Understanding in the Business World

Remarks by President Eisenhower¹

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this great audience:

It is a very definite honor for this Nation's Capital to be the host to such a distinguished body. I assure you that we are complimented by your presence.

I suppose seated here before me is the greatest concentration of financial genius that this world could produce. That being so, you can be sure of one thing: I am not going to talk about international finances. I think I would prefer to talk for a minute or two about some of the meanings—some of the results—of the kind of cooperation that you people are here to undertake.

International cooperation is the key to peace. It must come about. It must progress from year to year—or the world must be the poorer by reason of that failure.

We have the United Nations in order to spread understanding—one of the other—a place where we may debate our differences, rather than resort to the ancient arbiter of force—an organization to promote and sustain peace. We have such defensive organizations as NATO and SEATO and the Organization of American States—all having as one of their main purposes the security of all of the member states against unwarranted attack.

In this International Bank and the International Monetary Fund, we have the possibility of extending this cooperative field into our business life—the international business life. As mutual understanding and good will and, above all, confidence in each other are the basis of any successful business within a nation, so it is in the international world.

As confidence grows, in turn based upon mutual

¹ Made at a meeting of the Boards of Governors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund at Washington, D. C., on Sept. 28 (White House press release dated Sept. 28).

understanding, and based upon meetings such as these, we are bound to have a general rise in the living standards of the world. Business thrives in the spirit, the confidence, thus engendered.

So, you pool long-term capital and provide technical advice and help for all of the organisms that are struggling to produce wealth so that all the people of the world may prosper. You do it together and therefore add to the strength of each, so that the whole total becomes one not only formidable—it is truly overwhelming in its influence.

I have only one other word to say. It has to do with an experience of mine in wartime, where I was working with groups that had among themselves to develop real cooperation or there could be no success. There are men in this audience who were my associates in that work. We early found one thing: Without the heart, without the enthusiasm for the cause in which we were working, no cooperation was possible. With that enthusiasm, subordinating all else to the advancement of the cause, cooperation was easy.

Now it seems to me you people have shown your enthusiasm for doing your part in developing this growing and expanding world economy by coming here, by coming from so many different nations—giving your time and your effort to meet with others in order that the whole may prosper.

Because you do show that enthusiasm, that kind of leadership, I venture to offer to each of you my felicitations and my complete confidence that nothing you could be now doing in your own country or elsewhere is more worthwhile than what you are doing here—in this great meeting you have been holding.

Again I say, Washington—this Nation's Capital—this entire Government—the American people—are proud to have had you here. We hope only that these meetings may be frequent and each one of them more fruitful than its predecessor.

Thank you very much.

President's Citizen Advisers on Mutual Security

James C. Hagerty, press secretary to President Eisenhower, announced on September 5 that the President had on that day appointed Benjamin Fairless, former president and chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corporation, as coordinator of a committee to review the foreign

assistance programs of the United States and to make recommendations as to the future policy of the Government with respect to military, economic, technical, and other programs in the light of foreign policy and the national interest of the United States. The group will be called the President's Citizen Advisers on the Mutual Security Program.

On September 22 Mr. Hagerty announced the names of the other members of the group:

Colgate W. Darden, Jr., president of the University of Virginia

Richard R. Deupree, chairman of the board of Proctor and Gamble Co.

John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America

Whitelaw Reid, chairman of the board of the New York Herald Tribune

Walter Bedell Smith, former director of the Central Intelligence Agency, former Under Secretary of State, vice chairman of the American Machine and Foundry Co.

Jesse W. Tapp, vice chairman of the board of directors of the Bank of America

The group held its first meeting at Washington on September 27.

President's Views on U.S. Aid to Refugees and Escapees

Representative Kenneth B. Keating of New York on September 20 wrote to President Eisenhower in connection with his forthcoming visit to Europe as a member of the U.S. delegation to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. Following is the text of the President's reply, released by the White House on September 25.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1956

DEAR KEN: I am delighted to learn of your forthcoming visit to Europe in the interest of refugees and escapees.

It is fundamental that free America remain an asylum for a substantial number of those who continue to risk their lives to reach freedom. I was, therefore, greatly disappointed that the Congress failed to heed my several requests to pass legislation to preserve this noble role of America in the world. It was no less than a tragedy for the people directly concerned abroad. Only nine days before the Congress adjourned, I emphasized my feelings about this in a letter of July 18 to Senator

Arthur Watkins.¹ I pointed out that this legislation was urgently needed in a critical situation, and was fully in the spirit of one of our country's proudest traditions—that of offering a haven to the persecuted and oppressed.

I will, of course, again urge such legislation in the next session of the Congress.

And I do hope that your present mission will help you to carry forward even more vigorously your efforts to persuade the House Committee on the Judiciary and the Congress of the need for early and favorable action in this field.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

U.S. Views on Polish Trials

Statement by President Eisenhower

White House press release dated September 26

Recent news from Poland indicates that at least some of the persons arrested in connection with the Poznan riots are soon to be put on trial. Friends of freedom throughout the world will be hoping that all of the accused will be given a genuinely fair and open trial with bona fide legal counsel to defend them and with an opportunity to speak their minds freely without fear of subsequent retribution and deportation eastward.

This would provide tangible evidence that some so-called Stalinist methods will be abandoned in practice as well as in theory. However, the limited information released publicly in Poland thus far regarding the trials is in no way reassuring. Apparently not even a complete list of those arrested has been made public.

Whatever the outcome of the trials, whatever the immediate and long-term effects of the Poznan riots, one fact has become clearer than ever. There can be no permanent solution of the situation in Poland until the Polish people are given an opportunity to elect a government of their own choosing.

The basic problem in Poland is not what particular type of economic or social system shall prevail; that is something which the Polish people can and should decide for themselves. What is essential is that they be given the opportunity to do so in free and unfettered elections.

¹ BULLETIN of July 30, 1956, p. 194.

General Pulaski's Memorial Day

A PROCLAMATION¹

WHEREAS a grateful Nation has enshrined in its heart the memory of those selfless men who came from across the seas and aided in the achievement of our independence during the Revolutionary War; and

WHEREAS October 11, 1956, marks the one hundred and seventy-seventh anniversary of the death of Count Casimir Pulaski, one of those heroes who left his homeland to fight in our cause, and who for that cause laid down his life; and

WHEREAS the story of his valiant assault upon the city of Savannah at the head of the Pulaski Legion, where he received a mortal wound, has long stirred the imagination and evoked the admiration of all who hold liberty dear; and

WHEREAS this distinguished Pole, who had achieved the rank of Brigadier General before his untimely death at the age of 31 years, left to posterity an inspiring example of fidelity to principle which we should cherish and emulate:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, do hereby invite the people of this Nation to observe Thursday, the eleventh day of October, 1956, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day with suitable commemorative ceremonies; and I direct that the flag of the United States be displayed on all Government buildings on that day as a mark of respect to the memory of General Pulaski.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this twenty-fourth day of September in the year of our Lord nine-
[SEAL] teen hundred and fifty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-first.



By the President:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES
Secretary of State.

Ambassadorial Talks at Geneva With Chinese Communists

Press release 504 dated September 24

For more than 13 months the United States has been carrying on discussions with the Chinese Communists at Geneva directed toward bringing about the release of our imprisoned citizens and obtaining a commitment from the Chinese Com-

munists for a meaningful renunciation of force to include the Taiwan area. Neither of these objectives has yet been achieved. On September 21 the Chinese Communists issued a statement announcing that they had proposed in the Geneva meetings that discussions be shifted to the question of relaxation of trade restrictions but that the United States had "in effect refused."

The United States is not prepared to enter into a discussion of trade restrictions with the Chinese Communists at a time when they continue to refuse to renounce the use of force in the Taiwan area and continue to hold imprisoned American citizens as political hostages, despite their pledge in the agreed announcement of September 10, 1955,¹ to permit them expeditiously to exercise their right to return. We have so informed the Chinese Communists at Geneva.

It is hardly reasonable to expect the United States to discuss a relaxation of its trade restrictions when the trade that would result from such a relaxation would strengthen a regime which refuses to renounce the use of force against us.

ICA Loan Agreement With Republic of China

A \$20-million loan agreement between the United States and the Republic of China on Taiwan (Formosa) has been formally signed by both countries, the International Cooperation Administration announced on September 17. The loan was planned last year as part of the \$70 million in economic aid extended by the United States to Taiwan from fiscal 1956 mutual security funds.

The mutual security legislation for fiscal year 1956 instructed Ica to make loans instead of grants of aid whenever possible. Similar agreements with 12 other countries will provide for the repayment to the United States of more than \$210 million of the economic aid funds extended during fiscal year 1956.

China entered a similar agreement with Ica in fiscal year 1955 for the repayment of \$20 million of that year's economic assistance, which totaled \$103 million.

Both years' loans are repayable over 40 years, with interest at 4 percent if repaid in Chinese currency and 3 percent if repaid in U.S. dollars.

¹No. 3156; 21 Fed. Reg. 7309.

¹BULLETIN of Sept. 19, 1955, p. 456.

Repayment of the loans begins 4 years from the date of signing.

The new loan to China, like the 1955 loan, was in Chinese currency which that country paid for U.S. surplus agricultural commodities sent as part of the aid program. The Chinese Government is using the funds primarily to extend loans to industries as part of its program to increase productive capacity and bring the country closer to self-support.

The Chinese Government is spending almost 60 percent of its total budget on its military effort, maintaining the second largest army in Free Asia. U.S. aid has played a significant part in transforming the once poorly equipped Chinese forces into well-armed, effective fighting units, and has helped prevent runaway inflation during this period of heavy military spending and industrial and agricultural development of the island's economy. Total U.S. nonmilitary aid to the Republic of China has amounted to over \$475 million since 1951.

Current Chinese Government programs abetted by U.S. aid are emphasizing agricultural development, expansion of electric-power facilities, and improvement of transportation and manufacturing facilities.

Chinese efforts coupled with U.S. assistance have resulted in remarkable economic gains in Taiwan during the past 5 years. Overall local production in 1955 was an estimated 50 percent above the 1950 level and has continued to expand in 1956. Farm output rose about 30 percent and industrial output doubled in the same 5-year period.

The new loan agreement was signed for China by P. H. Ho, chairman of the Chinese Technical Mission in this country. Signing for the United States was Samuel C. Waugh, President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which executes and administers collection of ICA loans.

Correction

BULLETIN of September 17, 1956, p. 442—The third paragraph under the heading "Statutory Authority" should read: "The Senate gave its advice and consent to ratification of the United Nations Charter on July 28, 1945, by a vote of 89 to 2."

Japanese Cotton Exports to the United States

Following is an exchange of notes between the United States and Japan on the subject of Japanese exports of cotton goods to the United States.¹

Press release 509 dated September 27

United States Note

The Secretary of State presents his compliments to His Excellency the Ambassador of Japan and has the honor to refer to his note of May 16, 1956 in which it is stated that the Government of Japan intends to adopt in 1957 controls on exports of cotton goods to the United States similar to those in effect for 1956.

The United States Government would appreciate receiving from the Government of Japan further information as to plans for future controls.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, September 25, 1956.

Japanese Note

The Ambassador of Japan presents his compliments to the Honorable the Secretary of State and has the honor to reply, as detailed in the attached paper, to the latter's note dated September 25, 1956, in which it is stated that the United States Government would appreciate receiving from the Government of Japan information on plans for future controls relative to the export of cotton products to the United States.

EMBASSY OF JAPAN,

Washington, September 27, 1956.

[Attachment]

The Japanese cotton textile industry and the appropriate agencies of the Japanese Government have now started discussions on the scale and scope of export adjustment measures for cotton textiles from Japan to the United States for 1957 and subsequent years.

The purpose of these measures, inaugurated in January 1956, is to effect orderly marketing by avoiding excessive concentration in any particular period or on any particular item and by con-

¹ For background, see BULLETIN of Dec. 26, 1955, p. 1064; Apr. 30, 1956, p. 728; and June 4, 1956, p. 921.

tinued efforts to achieve broader diversification of cotton textile exports.

With a view to improving the program as far as practicable, the following points will be incorporated.

(1) The initial overall ceiling for Japanese exports of cotton cloth and of cotton apparel and other cotton manufactures will be determined by the level of trade in 1955.

(2) Within the overall ceiling mentioned above, individual ceilings will be established, in addition to those already in effect, for such items which may tend to be exported in excessive concentration, thus causing undue hardship to a particular segment of the United States industry. Velveteens and gingham, among other items, will be the subject of special study for further reduction.

(3) Efforts will be made to distribute exports equally by quarters as far as practicable, and as necessary to meet seasonal demands for certain items.

(4) This program shall be effective for some years, starting from January 1, 1957, but may be reviewed annually.

The action now contemplated by Japan is based on the condition that all feasible steps will be taken by the United States Government to solve the problem of discriminatory state textile legislation and to prevent further restrictive action with regard to the importation of Japanese textiles into the United States.

Changes in Wool Tariff

WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT

White House press release dated September 28

The President announced on September 28 that he has issued a proclamation invoking the so-called Geneva wool-fabric reservation. The President's action, taken upon a recommendation from the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements, means that the ad valorem rate of duty applying to most woolen and worsted fabrics entering the country will be increased when such imports, in any year, exceed an amount determined by the President to be not less than 5 percent of the average annual U.S. production of

similar fabrics for the preceding 3 calendar years.

In any year the higher ad valorem duty, which will be 45 percent as authorized by the Geneva reservation, will apply only for the remainder of that year to imports in excess of the "breakpoint" determined by the President. At the beginning of the next calendar year the ad valorem duty will revert to present rates and will remain there until imports in that year reach the "breakpoint" determined by the President for that year.

The President's action is to be effective October 1, 1956. For the last 3 months of 1956 the President specified that the higher ad valorem duty would apply only after, and if, 3.5 million pounds of imports have entered the country—and only until the new calendar year begins on January 1, 1957. The "breakpoint" of 3.5 million pounds for the rest of 1956 is equal to three-twelfths of a quantity (14 million pounds) determined by the President to be not less than 5 percent of the average annual U.S. production of similar fabrics for the calendar years 1953-55.

In 1957 and subsequent years the President will notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the amount of imports above which the higher duty will apply in that year.

Present rates of duty are 30¢ or 37½¢ per pound (depending upon the nature of the fabric) plus 20 percent or 25 percent ad valorem (again depending on the nature of the fabric). When the "breakpoint" determined by the President is reached in any year, imports in excess of that amount will be subject to an ad valorem duty increase to the full 45 percent authorized by the Geneva reservation, but the specific duty (cents per pound) will be the same.

The Geneva wool-fabric reservation is a right that was reserved by the United States in a 1947 multilateral trade agreement at Geneva. It was reserved in connection with a tariff concession granted by the United States to the United Kingdom and, under our most-favored-nation obligations, it was extended to other countries. The 1947 tariff concession and the Geneva reservation apply to woolen and worsted fabrics dutiable under paragraphs 1108 and 1109 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as modified. Most woolen and worsted fabrics entering the United States are dutiable under these paragraphs. The President's action applies only to imports of such fabrics.

PROCLAMATION 3160¹

1. WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and the statutes, including section 350(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (ch. 474, 48 Stat. 943; ch. 118, 57 Stat. 125; ch. 269, 59 Stat. 410), on October 30, 1947, the President entered into a trade agreement with certain foreign countries, which trade agreement consists of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the related Protocol of Provisional Application thereof, together with the Final Act Adopted at the Conclusion of the Second Session of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment (61 Stat. (Parts 5 and 6) A7, A11, and A2051), and by Proclamation No. 2761A of December 16, 1947 (61 Stat. (Part 2) 1103),² the President proclaimed such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States and such continuance of existing customs or excise treatment of articles imported into the United States as were then found to be required or appropriate to carry out the said trade agreement on and after January 1, 1948;

2. WHEREAS items 1108 and 1109(a), and the appropriate headings, in Part I of Schedule XX annexed to the said General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which items were given effect by the said proclamation of December 16, 1947, read as follows:

Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph	Description of products	Rate of duty
1108	Woven fabrics, weighing not more than four ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool, regardless of value: If the warp is wholly of cotton or other vegetable fiber	30¢ per lb. and 25% ad val.
	Other	37½¢ per lb. and 25% ad val.
	NOTE: The United States reserves the right to increase the ad valorem part of the rate applicable to any of the fabrics provided for in item 1108 or 1109 (a) of this Part to 45 per centum ad valorem on any of such fabrics which are entered in any calendar year in excess of an aggregate quantity by weight of 5 per centum of the average annual production of similar fabrics in the United States during the 3 immediately preceding calendar years.	
1109 (a)	Woven fabrics, weighing more than four ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool, regardless of value.	37½¢ per lb. and 25% ad val.

3. WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and the statutes, including the said section 350 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, on April 21, 1951, the President entered into a

¹ 21 Fed. Reg. 7593.

² BULLETIN of Dec. 28, 1947, p. 1258.

trade agreement with certain foreign countries, which trade agreement consists of the Torquay Protocol to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (3 UST (pt. 1) 615, (pt. 2) 1841), and, by Proclamation No. 2929 of June 2, 1951 (65 Stat. C12),³ the President proclaimed such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States and such continuance of existing customs or excise treatment of articles imported into the United States as were then found to be required or appropriate to carry out the said trade agreement on and after June 6, 1951;

4. WHEREAS item 1109 (a), and the appropriate headings, in Part I of Schedule XX annexed to the said Torquay Protocol, which item was given effect by the said proclamation of June 2, 1951, reads as follows:

Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph	Description of products	Rate of duty
1109 (a)	Woven green billiard cloths in the piece, weighing over 11 but not over 15 ounces per square yard, wholly of wool, regardless of value, NOTE: This item shall be subject to the note in item 1108 in Part I of Schedule XX (original).	37½¢ per lb. and 20% ad val.

5. WHEREAS on September 26, 1956, the Government of the United States notified the Executive Secretary to the CONTRACTING PARTIES to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade that it invoked the reservation contained in the note to item 1108 set forth in the second recital of this proclamation, effective October 1, 1956;

6. WHEREAS the fourth general note to the said Schedule XX to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade specified in the second recital of this proclamation provides as follows:

"4. If any tariff quota provided for in this Schedule, other than those provided for in items 771, becomes effective after the beginning of a period specified as the quota year, the quantity of the quota product entitled to enter under the quota during the unexpired portion of the quota year shall be the annual quota quantity less ½ thereof for each full calendar month that has expired in such period.";

7. WHEREAS I find that upon invocation of the said reservation set forth in the second recital of this proclamation, effective October 1, 1956, it will be appropriate to carry out the trade agreement specified in the first recital of this proclamation that the ad valorem part of the rate be 45 per centum ad valorem in the case of any of the fabrics described in the said item 1108 or 1109 (a) in Part I of Schedule XX to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade set forth in the second recital of this proclamation, or in the said item 1109 (a) in Part I of Schedule XX to the Torquay Protocol set forth in the fourth recital of this proclamation, excepting in either case articles dutiable at rates applicable to such

³ 16 Fed. Reg. 5381.

fabrics by virtue of any provision of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, other than paragraph 1108 or 1109 (a) :

(a) during the period from October 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, both inclusive, if such fabrics are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the total aggregate quantity of 3,500,000 pounds of such fabrics has been so entered or withdrawn; which quantity I find to be not less than 1¼ per centum of the average annual production in the United States during the three immediately preceding calendar years of fabrics similar to such fabrics; and

(b) following December 31, 1956, until otherwise proclaimed by the President, if such fabrics are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in any calendar year after that total aggregate quantity by weight of such fabrics which shall have been notified by the President to the Secretary of the Treasury, and published in the *Federal Register*, has been so entered or withdrawn during such calendar year; which quantity the President shall have found to be not less than 5 per centum of the average annual production in the United States during the three immediately preceding calendar years of fabrics similar to such fabrics; and

8. WHEREAS the sixteenth recital of Proclamation No. 3140 of June 13, 1956 (21 F. R. 4237),⁴ amended the list set forth in the seventh recital of Proclamation No. 2769 of January 30, 1948 (62 Stat. (pt. 2) 1479), and it is required or appropriate to further amend such list:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the Statutes, including the said section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, do proclaim as follows:

1. In order to carry out the said trade agreements specified in the first and third recitals of this proclamation, until otherwise proclaimed by the President, the ad valorem part of the rate which shall be applied to the said fabrics described in the seventh recital of this proclamation, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in excess of the quantity specified in clause (a) of that recital, or in excess of a quantity notified to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to clause (b) of that recital, shall be 45 per centum ad valorem.

2. The said proclamation of December 16, 1947, specified in the first recital of this proclamation, and the said proclamation of June 2, 1951, specified in the third recital of this proclamation, as amended, shall be suspended to the extent necessary to give effect to the foregoing provisions of this proclamation.

3. In order to carry out the said trade agreement specified in the first recital of this proclamation, the list set forth in the seventh recital of the said proclamation of January 30, 1948, as amended by the said proclamation of June 13, 1956, is hereby further amended by deleting the last line in item 1406 of such list, reading "Cigar bands . . . 35¢ per lb."

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

⁴ BULLETIN of June 25, 1956, p. 1057.

DONE at the City of Washington this twenty-eighth day of September in the year of our Lord nineteen [SEAL] hundred and fifty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-first.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

By the President:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES
Secretary of State.

Tunisia To Receive U.S. Wheat

As a gift of the American people to the people of Tunisia, the United States will ship up to 45,000 tons of wheat to the newly independent North African nation to avert a threatening food shortage, the International Cooperation Administration announced on September 19. The critical food situation in Tunisia resulted from two successive short crops due to drought and from other unfavorable conditions. The Tunisian Government requested U.S. assistance in order to prevent famine among Tunisians.

The wheat is being made available to Tunisia under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (P. L. 480). This provision of the law is administered by ICA and authorizes the use of surplus U.S. agricultural commodities for emergency purposes. The grain, which will begin to move to Tunisia as soon as shipping arrangements can be completed, will come from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks and will have a Ccc value of \$6.5 million.

Besides free distribution of the grain, the Tunisian Government will also be able to use the wheat as part payment to workers engaged in public works projects, which should alleviate serious unemployment now prevalent in Tunisia.

Immigration Quota for Tunisia

A PROCLAMATION¹

WHEREAS under the provisions of section 201 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, jointly, are required to determine the annual quota of any quota area established pursuant to the provisions of section 202 (a) of the said Act, and to report to the President the quota of each quota area so determined; and

¹ No. 3158; 21 Fed. Reg. 7423.

WHEREAS under the provisions of section 202 (e) of the said Act, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, jointly, are required to revise the quotas, whenever necessary, to provide for any political change requiring a change in the list of quota areas or the territorial limits thereof; and

WHEREAS the country of Tunisia has heretofore constituted a subquota area within the immigration quota established for France and has, therefore, been subject to the limitation provided in section 202 (c) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 177-178); and

WHEREAS the country of Tunisia was granted its independence on March 20, 1956, and has been recognized as an independent country by the United States; and

WHEREAS the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General have reported to the President that in accordance with the duty imposed and the authority conferred upon them by section 201 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, they jointly have made the determination provided for and computed under the provisions of section 201 (a) of the said Act; and have fixed, in accordance therewith, an immigration quota for Tunisia as hereinafter set forth:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the aforesaid act of Congress, do hereby proclaim and make known that the annual quota area hereinafter enumerated has been determined in accordance with the law to be, and shall be, as follows:

Area No.	Quota Area	Quota
87	Tunisia	100

The provision of an immigration quota for any quota area is designed solely for the purpose of compliance with the pertinent provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act and is not to be considered as having any significance extraneous to such purpose.

Proclamation No. 2980 of June 30, 1952² is amended accordingly.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this twentieth day of September in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fifty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-first.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

By the President:

HERBERT HOOVER, Jr.

Acting Secretary of State.

² BULLETIN of July 14, 1952, p. 83.

Export-Import Bank Reports on Lending Activities

The Export-Import Bank of Washington made 156 loans totaling \$375.9 million to finance exports of U.S. equipment, commodities, and services to 39 countries in fiscal year 1956, according to the bank's annual report to Congress released on September 16 by the Board of Directors.¹

The bank's statement advised Congress that more than two-thirds of the bank's loans supported U.S. trade in the Western Hemisphere, which is the normal pattern of the bank's operations. During fiscal year 1956 the bank authorized 110 credits totaling \$156 million in 17 American Republics.

The bank made 24 credits for \$36.1 million to finance U.S. export sales in eight European countries, and 9 loans totaling \$158 million in four countries in Asia.

A total of 34 credits for development loans amounting to \$341.8 million, including a credit of \$60 million to Japan to buy U.S. cotton,² and 122 individual exporter credits totaling \$34 million comprised the 156 loans for the fiscal year.

Large loans for industrial or economic development represented by far the greater dollar volume of the bank's business in fiscal year 1956, as heretofore, and created the major share of overseas purchases of U.S. goods for export under its loans. The bank, nevertheless, continued its services to U.S. exporters seeking smaller loans under individual applications or under lines of credit as a result of the exporter credit-line program initiated by the bank in November 1954.

Under exporter credit lines the bank has made loans as low as \$2,700, as it did in connection with a current sale to an importer in Mexico, and as large as \$6.3 million to an importer in Italy.

During the fiscal year, 141 credit lines totaling \$177.4 million were in operation. These included 51 new credit lines for \$32.8 million. Credit lines usually are granted for a period of 1 year. Ten credit lines were allowed to lapse by exporters.

The bank reported a gross income of \$84.1 mil-

¹ For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.; price, 65 cents.

² BULLETIN of Aug. 15, 1955, p. 263.

lion for the fiscal year. After payment of \$23.9 million to the U.S. Treasury for interest on borrowed money, the net income established a record of \$60.2 million. The Directors voted, as in other years, to pay a dividend of \$22.5 million to the Treasury on its holdings of Export-Import Bank stock.

Summarizing its financial transactions for the fiscal year, the bank advised Congress that "total receipts were \$339 million, total disbursements were \$251.6 million, leaving \$87.4 million as the net receipts paid to the Treasury to be applied toward the balancing of the federal budget, or a rate of approximately \$1.6 million a week." The bank also brought its reserves to \$404.7 million, the highest point so far attained.

At the close of business June 30, the bank had paid to the Treasury during its 22-year service a total of \$166.3 million in interest and \$150.9 million in dividends, or total payments of \$317.2 million.

Administrative expenses of the bank were slightly higher this year, the report said, as the bank continued to increase its staff in order to facilitate its loan operations and handle an increased number of loan applications. The bank currently operates with a staff of 172. Administrative expenses for the year were 1.7 percent of gross income. The average ratio of administrative expense to gross income over the past 22 years has been 1.67 percent.

During the year the President, Directors, and members of the staff traveled abroad to 32 countries. The bank maintains no field offices, finding it more practicable to send representatives abroad periodically for investigations, inspections, or negotiations.

In an effort to make the services of the Export-Import Bank better known to overseas traders in the United States, the President and Board of Directors endeavored this fiscal year to make more information available about the bank. The bank reported to Congress that these efforts were directed primarily toward reaching businessmen and commercial bankers who benefit directly from its facilities.

Meetings were held in major cities of the country with commercial banks under the sponsorship of the Federal Reserve System. The report to Congress stated that "the Bank anticipates that it will be substantially more useful to United

States private enterprise in the future as a result of this program of explanation and information," which is being continued.

The bank reported to Congress that one of its borrowers in Brazil paid off a \$14 million loan during the year, approximately 13 years in advance of the stipulated final repayment date. This came about, the report said, as follows:

In 1942-43, the Bank loaned \$14 million to Cia. Vale do Rio Doce, S. A., to finance a project for developing its iron ore mining operations for export from the Itabira region of the State of Minas Gerais. By means of this loan, additional capital, and subsequent financing, 350 miles of railway were rebuilt and re-equipped, and loading facilities provided at the port of Vitoria. In 1942 the Brazilian company exported 35,000 tons of Itabira ore through this port. Thirteen years later, in 1955, the company exported 2,262,000 tons of ore from the same mines through the same port.

As a consequence, this project has earned more than \$100 million of dollar exchange for Brazil after service of the relative financing. The greater part of Itabira ore has been purchased by steel companies in the United States.

The loan was repaid by Cia. Vale do Rio Doce in April 1956, some 13 years before the final note on this credit was to become due.

\$3 Million World Bank Loan to Costa Rica

The World Bank on September 18 announced a loan of \$3 million in Costa Rica. The loan was made to the Central Bank of Costa Rica and will assist it in carrying on a lending program for the development of agriculture and light industry. The Chemical Corn Exchange Bank of New York is participating in the loan, without the World Bank's guaranty, to the extent of \$366,000, representing the first maturity and half the second maturity, which fall due October 1, 1958, and April 1, 1959.

Costa Rica is primarily an agricultural country. Its requirements for capital goods are mostly for agriculture, for the processing of agricultural products, and for light industries. To meet the need for imported capital goods the Government, at the end of 1952, initiated a credit program through the banking system. Under this program the Central Bank extends credit to commercial banks for the importation of capital goods required by individuals or private enterprises. The

commercial banks in turn extend credit to their customers for the purchase of these goods through normal trade channels. Applications for credit under this program are carefully examined, being considered, where appropriate, by the Rural Credit Boards or by the Ministry of Agriculture and Industries and the National Production Council to assure that they are for purposes significant to Costa Rica's development.

The program has proved to be effective and has been an important factor in the improvement in agricultural output and efficiency during the last few years. The World Bank loan will provide the foreign exchange needed by the Central Bank to carry forward the program until 1958. It is expected that most of the loan will be used for imports which will directly aid the further expansion of agriculture.

Agriculture now contributes 45 percent to the national income, accounts for 90 percent of exports, and directly employs over half the population. The availability of credit and the efficient administration of policies to promote agriculture have increased agricultural output in recent years. Technical services have been developed to an unusual degree. The research and training center of the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences is located at Turrialba and has become a major agricultural and livestock research station. There are adequate extension services to spread the results of research and to demonstrate opportunities for technological improvements. Farmers are receptive to the adoption of improved practices, and many of them have been able to take advantage of credits under the program for the purpose of investment in equipment, materials, and property development.

The loan is for a term of 7 years and bears interest of 4¾ percent, including the statutory commission of 1 percent. Amortization will begin October 1, 1958. The loan is the first World Bank loan in Costa Rica and is guaranteed by the Government of Costa Rica.

After having been approved by the Executive Directors, the loan documents were signed on September 18, 1956, by Gonzalo J. Facio, Ambassador of Costa Rica to the United States, on behalf of the Government of Costa Rica; by Jaime Solera, Chairman of the Board, on behalf of the Central Bank of Costa Rica; and by Eugene R. Black, President, on behalf of the World Bank.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Inscription of Suez Items on Security Council Agenda

*Statement by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
U.S. Representative to the United Nations*¹

The United States welcomes the initiative which the Governments of the United Kingdom and France have taken in bringing the Suez Canal matter to the Security Council for its consideration.² It is a further demonstration of the determination of these two governments to fulfill their charter obligations and to seek a peaceful solution. This is precisely what they and numerous other governments concerned with this situation have been doing since the action of the Government of Egypt against the Universal Suez Canal Company on July 26 of this year.

These governments and the United States Government have sought, consistent with our obligations under article 33 of the charter, to resolve the differences which have arisen between them and the Government of Egypt through negotiations with Egypt. The documents before the Council summarize in some detail the events which transpired at the first and second London conferences on the Suez Canal. Eighteen nations which attended the first conference agreed to proposals which they deemed just and practical as a basis for negotiating a new treaty for the control and operation of the canal. Unfortunately, these proposals were not accepted by the Government of Egypt. The same 18 nations met again in a second conference and again demonstrated their resourcefulness in the interests of peace by initiating the formation of the Suez Canal Users Association.

The Governments of the United Kingdom and France and of the United States, as well as other

¹ Made in the Security Council on Sept. 26 (U.S./U.N. press release 2459).

² For background, see BULLETIN of Aug. 27, 1956, p. 335; Sept. 3, 1956, p. 371; Sept. 24, 1956, p. 467; and Oct. 1, 1956, p. 503.

governments, have consistently sought a settlement based on justice and on their rights as users of the Suez Canal. The Governments of the United Kingdom and France have now come to the Security Council, and we hope the other users of the canal will support them in their determination that a lasting settlement which protects the rights of all concerned shall be achieved. It is essential that the rights of users of the canal rest on a basis other than unilateral promises.

Mr. President, in the Security Council debate which is to ensue, the United States will seek a peaceful and just settlement of the Suez Canal situation, and it hopes that this will be the attitude of all members of this body.

In this spirit, the United States will vote in favor of the adoption of the provisional agenda as circulated. We will vote in favor of the inscription of the item proposed by the United Kingdom and France,³ and we will also vote in favor of the inscription of the item proposed by Egypt.⁴

The United States will be acting in accordance with its generally liberal policy with respect to the inclusion of items on the agenda despite the serious reservations which we may have as to the merit of certain of those items. This is consistent with the United States action in voting in favor of the inscription of items on at least four previous occasions when the proposed item was directed against the United States.

In 1950, for example, we voted in favor of inscribing an item charging the United States with armed invasion of the territory of China and violation of the charter. Again in 1950 we voted for inscription of an item charging the invasion of China by United States air forces and bombing by those air forces of the territory of China. In 1952 we did not object to the inscription of an item charging—of all things!—the United States with engaging in bacteriological warfare. And in 1953 we did not object to the inscription of an item charging the United States with actions in violation of the Italian peace treaty and threatening the peace. In each of these previous cases the charges against the United States, preposterous and fallacious though they were, did not deter us from not objecting to the inscription of the item.

³ U.N. doc. S/3654.

⁴ U.N. doc. S/3656.

We therefore do not feel that we should oppose the inscription of an item such as the one proposed by the Government of Egypt making charges against the United Kingdom and France. This of course does not mean that we agree with the contention contained in the Egyptian item—that the United Kingdom and France have acted in any way inconsistent with their obligations under the United Nations Charter. It should also be understood, Mr. President, that we vote as we do in the belief that the Anglo-French proposal should have complete priority and that consideration of the Egyptian item should be deferred until the Anglo-French item has been disposed of.

With regard to the question of our next meeting, the United States Government concurs in the views already expressed by the representatives of the United Kingdom and France that, since several Foreign Ministers will participate in our debate, this Council should extend them the courtesy of waiting until they can conveniently arrive.⁵

U.S. Position on Proposed Slavery Convention

*Statement by Walter Kotschnig*¹

In my brief remarks I will not address myself to any specific aspects of or any articles in the proposed convention. It is proper, however, at this point for me to define the position of the United States Government in this conference.

The Government and the people of the United States detest and abhor slavery in any form or any institutions or practices similar to slavery. There are few, if any, countries in the world which have made such supreme sacrifices as have the American people to abolish and exterminate slavery

⁵ In the voting on Sept. 26, the Council decided unanimously to inscribe the Anglo-French item. The vote on inscription of the Egyptian item was 7 (U.S.)-0-4 (Australia, Belgium, France, U.K.).

¹ Made on Aug. 15 at Geneva before the U.N. Conference of Plenipotentiaries on a Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery. Mr. Kotschnig, Director of the Office of International Economic and Social Affairs of the Department of State, was U.S. Delegate to the conference.

within their own territory. The adoption of the 13th amendment to our Constitution, which is the supreme law of the land, outlawed for all times all slavery in any form or guise.

The United States also ratified the Anti-Slavery Convention of 1926.² In this connection I should like to point out that in ratifying that convention we made a reservation expressing our disagreement with the concept contained in the convention permitting the use of forced labor on any basis other than as a punishment for crime. In other words, we have consistently taken an absolutist position in our opposition to any form of slavery and have not been willing to accept any half-measures.

I am reciting these facts so as not to leave the shadow of a doubt about the basic position of my Government with regard to slavery. What I have just stated must be clearly remembered to understand the attitude which my Government is taking to the proposed convention.

First, my Government has some real doubt about the efficacy of any additional convention in the field of slavery. There are a number of states which have not yet ratified the convention of 1926—among them, states which might usefully ratify it with a view to abolishing all remnants of slavery. It does seem to us that efforts to obtain additional ratification of the 1926 convention might be more fruitful than the conclusion of a new convention which again might not be widely enough ratified to make it fully effective.

Second, many of the provisions of the proposed new convention deal with subjects generally considered to be in the area of domestic jurisdiction. Wherever this is the case my Government holds that better results might be achieved through public debate, which would result in a clarification of facts and information and bring the weight of world public opinion to bear on any shortcomings. Perhaps even more effective are educational measures, which obviously take some time, and possibly economic and other assistance designed to help eliminate any traces of slavery.

In the light of this position held by my Government and under these circumstances my delegation, by and large, does not propose to take an active part in the discussion of specific articles,

nor is it the intention of the United States Government to sign or ratify the convention.

We have nevertheless come to this conference considering the importance of the subject which it is discussing. We do not want to stand aloof from a United Nations effort of evident interest to many. We hope to be able to assist in the defining of some aspects of the proposed convention, such as article 9, which bears upon the broad issue of the accession to the convention of various states. We believe that any convention developed under United Nations auspices should be truly a United Nations instrument and should be exclusively a vehicle of action of the members of the United Nations and its family, that is to say, the specialized agencies. This is a self-evident principle which if integrally applied will preserve the technical nature of the conference and will avoid undesirable political discussions which are beyond the scope of this technical conference.

Mr. President, as representative of the United States Government, and on behalf of my Government, I wish this conference every success in its work.

11th Assembly of Inter-American Commission of Women

The following report on the 11th Assembly of the Inter-American Commission of Women was prepared by Mrs. Frances M. Lee, U.S. Representative on the Commission and U.S. delegate to the Assembly. Miss Jane Topper served as alternate delegate. Miss Muna Lee of the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Department of State, served as adviser to the U.S. delegation through the first week of the Assembly.

The Inter-American Commission of Women held its 11th Assembly June 1-21, 1956, at Ciudad Trujillo at the invitation of the Dominican Republic. Its principal concern was to encourage citizenship training and full legal capacity for women under the laws of the various countries. Delegates were present from 18 of the 21 American Republics. Official representatives were present also from the United Nations, the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and the International Labor Organization.

Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo addressed the Assembly at its opening session, and the Govern-

² Convention to suppress the slave trade and slavery (46 Stat. 2183; Treaty Series 778).

ment provided full secretariat and other services. The universities and normal schools presented special programs for the Assembly.

In accordance with plans adopted in 1953, the Inter-American Commission of Women gives attention in each Assembly to only two major fields of interest. The agenda for this Assembly dealt primarily with political and civil rights for women, the latter topic embracing matters in the field of family and property law. The U.S. delegation based its contributions to the discussion on experience in this country in legislation and community activities. Since responsibility for legislation relating to the family is reserved under the United States Constitution to our State governments, the delegation was able to take advantage of variations in legal tradition and social and economic development in many different parts of the United States.

The Commission's interest in responsible and intelligent use of the franchise has grown with the extension of woman suffrage. Whereas in 1928, when the Commission was organized, only the women in the United States had suffrage rights, today women vote in all but one of the American Republics. In 1952, when the U.S. delegation to the 8th Assembly provided a display of pamphlet material used in citizenship education programs in this country, the supply of samples was immediately exhausted. In the Assembly last year attention was called to a special Unesco publication designed for girls' schools and similar groups studying citizen responsibilities. In this Assembly interest was concentrated on leadership training. The Commission noted that the United Nations had recently established a program of advisory services in the field of human rights under which governments could request the organization of seminars, and urged the development of one or more seminars in Latin America under this program on the responsibilities of citizenship. It also urged the inclusion of civic education in school curricula.

The Assembly noted the increasing number of women in important public posts. It recommended that information about women in the professions and other aspects of public life be included in the census data to be collected throughout the Americas in 1960.

Dr. Grinberg-Vinaver, the United Nations representative in the Assembly, gave a report on the

civil rights of women during the Assembly's discussion of the rights of married women. The Commission adopted a resolution urging the removal of any existing limitations on the legal capacity of married women and on their right to establish a separate legal domicile where necessary and to administer property, exercise parental responsibility, act as guardians, and fulfill other legal functions. The United States abstained on this resolution, explaining that, while in sympathy with its objectives, the United States does not regard detailed recommendations as appropriate in this field in view of the variations in the legislation in our States and because laws relating to marriage and the family are so closely related to the customs of each country.

Since the chairman of the Commission, Mrs. María Concepción Leyes de Chaves of Paraguay, could not attend the Assembly because of illness and did not expect to be able to resume her duties immediately, the Assembly authorized the Executive Committee to further the work of the Commission during the interim.

A number of nongovernmental organizations had observers at Assembly sessions. The National Council of Catholic Women of the United States had a special observer present, and the International Council of Women was also represented by a U.S. citizen. As was the case last year when the Commission met at San Juan, Puerto Rico, at the invitation of the United States,¹ the presence of these organization leaders added greatly to the significance of the Assembly.

The Commission decided to hold its next Assembly in 1957 at the headquarters of the Pan American Union at Washington. While the United States will not be the host to this Assembly, the sessions at Washington will be an unusual opportunity for women's organizations in this country to observe the work of the Commission and offer hospitality to the delegates. The 1957 Assembly will be concerned primarily with education and economic opportunities for women. The rapid progress of women in both the political and economic fields adds to the urgency of these topics and to the need of careful planning for their study and discussion.

¹ For a report by Mrs. Lee on the 10th Assembly, see BULLETIN of Oct. 10, 1955, p. 584.

Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography

General Assembly

- International Law Commission. Regime of the High Seas and Regime of the Territorial Sea. Addendum to the Report by J. P. A. François, Special Rapporteur. Summary of replies from Governments and Conclusions of the Special Rapporteur (Continuation). A/CN.4/97/Add. 3, May 9, 1956. 17 pp. mimeo.
- Draft Report of the International Law Commission Covering the Work of Its Eighth Session. Chapter II, Law of the Sea. II. Articles concerning the Law of the Sea. Part I, The Territorial Sea. A/CN.4/L.68/Add. 2, June 25, 1956. 35 pp. mimeo.
- Report of the International Law Commission Covering the Work of Its Eighth Session, 23 April-4 July 1956. A/CN.4/104, July 7, 1956. 137 pp. mimeo.
- Constitutions, Electoral Laws and Other Legal Instruments Relating to Political Rights of Women. Memorandum by the Secretary-General. A/3145, July 26, 1956. 26 pp. mimeo.
- Election of Members of the International Law Commission. List of Candidates Nominated by Member States. A/3155, August 1, 1956. 5 pp. mimeo.
- System of Allowances to Members of Commissions, Committees and Other Subsidiary Bodies of the General Assembly or Other Organs of the United Nations. Third report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to the Eleventh Session of the General Assembly. A/3161, August 3, 1956. 5 pp. mimeo.
- Election of Members of the International Law Commission. Statements of Qualifications of Candidates Nominated by Member States. A/3156, August 6, 1956. 64 pp. mimeo.
- Educational Advancement in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Offers of Study and Training Facilities Under Resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954. Report of the Secretary-General. A/3165, August 10, 1956. 12 pp. mimeo.
- Registration and Publication of Treaties and International Agreements. A/3168, August 16, 1956. 50 pp. mimeo.
- The Togoland Unification Problem and the Future of the Trust Territory of Togoland Under British Administration. Special report of the Trusteeship Council. A/3169, August 22, 1956. 18 pp. mimeo.
- Budget Estimates for the Financial Year 1957. Form of the Budget. Report of the Secretary-General. A/C.5/662, August 30, 1956. 8 pp. mimeo.

Trusteeship Council

- Administrative Unions Affecting Trust Territories. Report of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions. T/L.716, July 30, 1956. 57 pp. mimeo.
- The Future of Togoland Under French Administration. Memorandum by the Administering Authority. T/1274, July 30, 1956. 4 pp. mimeo.
- The Future of Togoland Under French Administration. Memorandum by the Administering Authority. T/1274/Rev. 1, July 31, 1956. 4 pp. mimeo.
- Draft Report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands Covering the Period From 23 July 1955 to -- August 1956. T/L.717, August 1, 1956. 5 pp. mimeo.
- The Togoland Unification Problem and the Future of the Trust Territory of Togoland Under British Administration. T/L.719, August 2, 1956. 6 pp. mimeo.
- Conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru. (Working paper prepared by the Secretariat.) T/L.686/Add. 1, August 3, 1956. 7 pp. mimeo.

- Conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru. Report of the Drafting Committee. T/L.720, August 3, 1956. 15 pp. mimeo.
- Conditions in the Trust Territory of Western Samoa. Report of the Drafting Committee. T/L.721, August 6, 1956. 12 pp. mimeo.
- Conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea. Working paper prepared by the Secretariat. T/L.687/Add. 1, August 8, 1956. 4 pp. mimeo.
- Conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea. Report of the Drafting Committee. T/L.726, August 8, 1956. 16 pp. mimeo.
- Conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru. Summary of observations made by individual members of the Council during the general discussion and of the comments of the representative and Special Representative of the Administering Authority. T/L.727, August 8, 1956. 27 pp. mimeo.
- Conditions in the Trust Territory of Western Samoa. Summary of observations made by individual members of the Council during the general discussion and of the comments of the representative and the Special Representative of the Administering Authority. T/L.728, August 8, 1956. 34 pp. mimeo.
- Conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea. Summary of observations made by individual members of the Council during the general discussion and of the comments of the representative and Special Representative of the Administering Authority. T/L. 729, August 8, 1956. 36 pp. mimeo.

Disarmament Commission

- Note Verbale Dated 25 July 1956 From the Permanent Representative of India to the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission. DC/98, July 31, 1956. 3 pp. mimeo.

Economic and Social Council

- World Economic Situation. Full Employment. Implementation of full employment and balance of payments policies. Replies of governments to the questionnaire on full employment and balance of payments, submitted under resolution 520 B (VI) of the General Assembly and resolutions 221 E (IX), 290 (XI) and 371 B (XIII) of the Economic and Social Council. Contents: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Greece, Honduras, Italy; Statement for the Trust Territory of Somaliland, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America. E/2871/Add. 1, May 23, 1956. 123 pp. mimeo.
- General Review of the Development and Co-ordination of the Economic, Social and Human Rights Programmes and Activities of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies as a Whole. Co-ordination of UNICEF programmes with the regular and technical assistance programmes of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. A supplementary report by the Secretary-General under Council resolution 543 (XVIII). E/2892, May 29, 1956. 18 pp. mimeo.
- The European Steel Market in 1955. E/ECE/239, E/ECE/STEEL/106, June 1956. 131 pp. mimeo.
- Commission on International Commodity Trade. Second Report. Report to the Economic and Social Council on the second session of the Commission, held in Geneva from 28 November to 10 December 1955, and on the third session of the Commission, held in New York from 7 to 18 May 1956. E/2886, E/CN.13/20, June 5, 1956. 47 pp. mimeo.
- Commission on International Commodity Trade. International Commodity Trade in 1955 and 1956 (First Quarter). General review by the Secretariat. E/CN.13/22, June 5, 1956. 38 pp. mimeo.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Atomic Energy

Agreement between the Governments of the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom as to disposition of rights in atomic energy inventions. Signed at Washington September 24, 1956. Entered into force September 24, 1956.

Cultural Property

Convention for protection of cultural property in event of armed conflict, and regulations of execution. Done at The Hague May 14, 1954. Entered into force August 7, 1956.¹

Ratification deposited: Poland, August 6, 1956.

Accession deposited: Bulgaria, August 7, 1956.

Protocol for protection of cultural property in event of armed conflict. Done at The Hague May 14, 1954. Entered into force August 7, 1956.¹

Ratification deposited: Poland, August 6, 1956.

Accession deposited: Hungary, August 16, 1956.

Telecommunications

International telecommunication convention. Signed at Buenos Aires December 22, 1952. Entered into force January 1, 1954. TIAS 3266.

Ratifications deposited: Venezuela (with reservation), August 24, 1956; Thailand, August 27, 1956.

Notification by Portugal of extension to: Portuguese Overseas Territories, August 20, 1956.

Final protocol to the international telecommunication convention. Signed at Buenos Aires December 22, 1952. Entered into force January 1, 1954. TIAS 3266.

Ratification deposited: Venezuela, August 24, 1956.

Additional protocols to the international telecommunication convention. Signed at Buenos Aires December 22, 1952. Entered into force December 22, 1952.

Ratification deposited: Venezuela, August 24, 1956.

Trade and Commerce

Protocol of terms of accession of Japan to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, with annex A (schedules of the contracting parties) and annex B (schedule of Japan). Done at Geneva June 7, 1955. Entered into force September 10, 1955. TIAS 3438.

Signature: Turkey, August 16, 1956.

Wheat

International wheat agreement, 1956. Open for signature at Washington through May 18, 1956.

Acceptances deposited: Argentina and Italy, September 25, 1956; Canada, September 26, 1956.

BILATERAL

Greece

Agreement concerning the status of United States forces in Greece. Signed at Athens September 7, 1956. Entered into force September 7, 1956.

¹ Not in force for the United States.

India

Agricultural commodities agreement under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 454, 455; 69 Stat. 44, 721), with annex and letters. Signed at New Delhi August 29, 1956. Entered into force August 29, 1956.

Norway

Agreement further amending annex C of the mutual defense assistance agreement of January 27, 1950, as amended (TIAS 2016, 2418, 2437, 2914, 3143, 3492). Effected by exchange of notes at Oslo August 14 and 23, 1956. Entered into force August 23, 1956.

Peru

Surplus agricultural commodities agreement for drought assistance, pursuant to titles I and II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 454, 455, 457; 69 Stat. 44, 721). Effected by exchange of notes at Lima April 17, May 4 and 8, 1956. Entered into force May 8, 1956.

Spain

Agreement amending the surplus agricultural commodities agreement of March 5, 1956, as supplemented (TIAS 3510, 3540, 3527), by providing for the purchase of beef. Signed at La Toja September 15, 1956. Entered into force September 15, 1956.

Agreement supplementing the facilities assistance program agreement of April 9, May 11 and 19, 1954, as extended (TIAS 3098, 3257), by providing for further expansion of the program. Effected by exchange of notes at Madrid September 17, 1956. Entered into force September 17, 1956.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

New Passport Agency Opening at Los Angeles

The Department of State announced on September 27 (press release 510) the opening of a new passport agency at Los Angeles on October 1, 1956. The agency will be located at 500 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif.

The agent in charge will be Miss Gene Burke, and the assistant agent will be William G. Nerren. The agency will be staffed with approximately 15 persons. The staff will include adjudicators and technicians trained in the Passport Office at Washington, D.C. The agency will be equipped to issue passports in emergency or urgent cases after obtaining clearance from Washington by wire service.

During the first 6 months of 1956, the Passport Office in Washington has tabulated a figure of

44,575 passport applications received from the State of California. Of this figure, approximately 40 percent came from the Los Angeles area. It is anticipated that the new agency will handle approximately 35,000 passport applications next year.

Resignations

Herbert V. Prochnow as Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, effective November 15. For texts of Mr. Prochnow's letter to President Eisenhower and the President's reply, see White House press release dated September 26.

Designations

Ware Adams as Director, Office of United Nations Political and Security Affairs, effective September 19.

Otis E. Mulliken as Deputy Director, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, effective September 19.

Edward Freers as Director, Office of Eastern European Affairs, effective September 23.

Livingston Satterthwaite as Director, Office of Transport and Communications, effective September 23.

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Safety of Life at Sea—Correction of Error in the Regulations Annexed to the Convention of June 10, 1948. TIAS 3590. 3 pp. 5¢.

Notifications by the United Kingdom dated June 5, 1953, and August 5, 1955. Acceptance by the United States dated September 22, 1955.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. TIAS 3591. 752 pp. \$2.25.

Sixth protocol of supplementary concessions to the agreement of October 30, 1947—Done at Geneva May 23, 1956. Entered into force with respect to the United States June 30, 1956.

Health and Sanitation—Extension of Program. TIAS 3592. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Colombia. Exchange of notes—Signed at Bogotá April 25 and May 17, 1956. Entered into force May 25, 1956.

Mutual Aid Settlement. TIAS 3594. 9 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States and Poland—Signed at Washington June 28, 1956. Entered into force June 28, 1956.

Safety of Life at Sea. TIAS 3597. 8 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and other governments. Done at Washington January 4, 1956. Entered into force July 5, 1956.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 3598. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Brazil, amending agreement of November 16, 1955. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington June 28 and 29, 1956. Entered into force June 29, 1956.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 3599. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Italy, supplementing agreement of May 23, 1955, as supplemented. Signed at Rome July 5, 1956. Entered into force July 5, 1956.

Atomic Energy—Cooperation for Civil Uses. TIAS 3600. 7 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Austria. Signed at Washington June 8, 1956. Entered into force July 13, 1956.

German Trade-Marks in Italy. TIAS 3601. 7 pp. 10¢.

Understanding between the United States of America, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Italy. Signed at Rome July 5, 1956. Entered into force July 5, 1956.

Economic Development. TIAS 3602. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Libya. Exchange of notes—Signed at Tripoli June 27, 1956. Entered into force June 27, 1956.

Bahamas Long Range Proving Ground—Establishment of Additional Sites in Ascension Island. TIAS 3603. 17 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Signed at Washington June 25, 1956. Entered into force June 25, 1956.

Air Force Mission to Bolivia. TIAS 3604. 15 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Bolivia. Signed at La Paz June 30, 1956. Entered into force June 30, 1956.

Army Mission to Bolivia. TIAS 3605. 14 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Bolivia. Signed at La Paz June 30, 1956. Entered into force June 30, 1956.

Economic Development. TIAS 3606. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Afghanistan. Exchange of notes—Signed at Kabul June 23, 1956. Entered into force June 23, 1956.

Defense—Criminal Jurisdiction Over United States Forces. TIAS 3607. 6 pp. 5¢.

Understanding between the United States of America and Libya, relating to article XX (2) of agreement of September 9, 1954. Signed at Tripoli February 24, 1955. Entered into force February 24, 1955; operative retroactively October 30, 1954.

October 8, 1956

Index

Vol. XXXV, No. 902

Agriculture

Japanese Cotton Exports to the United States (text of notes)	554
Tunisia To Receive U.S. Wheat	557
American Republics. 11th Assembly of Inter-American Commission of Women (Lee)	562
Argentina. Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference	543
Atomic Energy	
Opening of Discussions on Statute of International Atomic Energy Agency (Strauss, Wadsworth)	535
U.S., U.K., Canada To Interchange Atomic Energy Patent Rights (text of agreement)	540
Canada. U.S., U.K., Canada To Interchange Atomic Energy Patent Rights (text of agreement)	540
China	
Ambassadorial Talks at Geneva With Chinese Communists	553
ICA Loan Agreement With Republic of China	553
Congress. President's Views on U.S. Aid to Refugees and Escapees	552
Costa Rica. \$3 Million World Bank Loan	559
Department and Foreign Service	
Designations (Adams, Mulliken, Freers, Satterthwaite)	566
New Passport Agency Opening at Los Angeles	565
Resignations (Prochnow)	566
Economic Affairs	
Changes in Wool Tariff (text of proclamation)	555
Export-Import Bank Reports on Lending Activities	558
International Understanding in the Business World (Eisenhower)	551
Japanese Cotton Exports to the United States (text of notes)	554
\$3 Million World Bank Loan to Costa Rica	559
Tunisia To Receive U.S. Wheat	557
U.S. Position on Proposed Slavery Convention (Kotschnig)	561
Educational Exchange. Foreign Governments Invited To Send Election Observers to United States (text of invitation)	550
Egypt	
Inscription of Suez Items on Security Council Agenda (Lodge)	560
Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference	543
Germany. Deputy Under Secretary Murphy To Visit Germany	550
Health, Education and Welfare	
11th Assembly of Inter-American Commission of Women (Lee)	562
U.S. Position on Proposed Slavery Convention (Kotschnig)	561
Iceland. Icelandic Foreign Minister Invited to Washington	542
Immigration and Naturalization. Immigration Quota for Tunisia (text of proclamation)	557
International Organizations and Meetings. Opening of Discussions on Statute of International Atomic Energy Agency (Strauss, Wadsworth)	535
Israel. Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference	543
Japan. Japanese Cotton Exports to the United States (text of notes)	554
Mutual Security	
ICA Loan Agreement With Republic of China	553
Icelandic Foreign Minister Invited to Washington	542
President's Citizen Advisers on Mutual Security	551
Tunisia To Receive U.S. Wheat	557

Poland

General Pulaski's Memorial Day (text of proclamation)	553
U.S. Views on Polish Trials (Eisenhower)	552
Presidential Documents	
Changes in Wool Tariff	555
General Pulaski's Memorial Day	553
Immigration Quota for Tunisia	557
International Understanding in the Business World	551
U.S. Views on Polish Trials	552
Publications. Recent Releases	566
Refugees and Displaced Persons. President's Views on U.S. Aid to Refugees and Escapees	552
Treaty Information	
Current Actions	565
U.S., U.K., Canada To Interchange Atomic Energy Patent Rights (text of agreement)	540
Tunisia	
Immigration Quota for Tunisia (text of proclamation)	557
Tunisia To Receive U.S. Wheat	557
United Kingdom. U.S., U.K., Canada To Interchange Atomic Energy Patent Rights (text of agreement)	540
United Nations	
Current U.N. Documents	564
Inscription of Suez Items on Security Council Agenda (Lodge)	560
Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference	543
U.S. Position on Proposed Slavery Convention (Kotschnig)	561
Uruguay. Letters of Credence (Lacarte Muro)	542

Name Index

Adams, Ware	566
Dulles, Secretary	543
Eisenhower, President	551, 552, 553, 555, 557
Fairless, Benjamin	551
Freers, Edward	566
Jonsson, Emil	542
Kotschnig, Walter	561
Lacarte Muro, Julio A.	542
Lee, Frances M.	562
Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr.	560
Mulliken, Otis E.	566
Murphy, Robert	550
Prochnow, Herbert V.	566
Satterthwaite, Livingston	566
Strauss, Lewis L.	535
Wadsworth, James J.	535

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: September 24-30

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

No.	Date	Subject
503	9/24	U.S.-U.K.-Canadian atomic agreement.
504	9/24	Geneva talks with Chinese Communists.
*505	9/24	Visit of Austrian provincial governors.
506	9/25	Murphy to visit Germany.
507	9/26	Dulles: U.S. position on Suez (combined with No. 508).
508	9/26	Dulles: news conference.
509	9/27	Exchange of notes with Japan on cotton exports.
510	9/27	Passport agency in Los Angeles (rewrite).
511	9/28	Uruguay credentials (rewrite).
512	9/28	Invitations to Iron Curtain countries to observe U.S. elections.
513	9/29	Visit of Icelandic Foreign Minister.

*Not printed.



the
Department
of
State

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed And:

\$
(cash, check, or
money order).

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

A new release in the popular *Background* series . . .

**United Nations General Assembly—
A Review of the Tenth Session**

The tenth regular session of the United Nations General Assembly convened on September 20, 1955, and adjourned 3 months later on December 20.

Highlights of the tenth session which are described in this *Background* pamphlet are:

1. The admission of 16 new members, enlarging U.N. membership from 60 to 76 countries.
2. The endorsement of further steps toward the establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency and the recommendation for a second international conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy.
3. The decision to give priority in U.N. disarmament talks to confidence-building measures, including President Eisenhower's proposal of mutual aerial inspection and Marshal Bulganin's plan for establishing control posts at strategic centers, as well as all such measures of adequately safeguarded disarmament as are feasible.
4. The progress made toward early establishment of the International Finance Corporation.
5. The decision to explore the organization of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development.
6. The Assembly approval of a Charter Review Conference "at an appropriate time," the date and place to be fixed at a subsequent session of the Assembly.

Copies of this publication may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at 15 cents a copy.

Publication 6322

15 cents

Please send me copies of *United Nations General Assembly—
A Review of the Tenth Session*.

Name:

Street Address:

City, Zone, and State:

TO AVOID
300